Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

THE WORLD SOUL

By H. FIELDING-HALL

In Demy 8vo, Cloth gilt, 10s. 6d. net

SECOND EDITION

"We should like to see this book violently challenged and reviled, that its good influence might spread."—*Observer.*

"The book is well written."—*Truth.*

"'The World Soul' is a book which commands the admiration of all who really feel themselves in sympathy with the teaching of Christ."—*Irish Times.*

"It is in many ways a remarkable volume, and we may predict with some confidence that a work so full of mystical idealism, yet so closely reasoned and persuasively written, will have influence as well as interest."—*Birmingham Post.*

"Mr. Fielding-Hall is always well worth reading, for no Englishman has done more to bring the light of Asia to bear upon some of the darker corners of our Western life. Perhaps there is no ray of this Asian light which, if it can be got to penetrate the armour of our self-pride, would prove more healing than this spiritual doctrine of the union of man with Nature."—*The Nation.*

THE HEARTS OF MEN

In Large Crown 8vo, Cloth gilt, 6s. net

THIRD EDITION REVISED

"This is a book, not of one religion nor of several religions, but of religion. Mainly, it is true, it treats of Christianity and Buddhism, because these are the two great representative faiths, but it is not confined to them."—*From the Author's Preface.*

London: HURST AND BLACKETT, LTD.

THE PASSING OF EMPIRE

By H. FIELDING-HALL

In Demy 8vo, Cloth gilt, ***10s. 6d.*** *net*

The Author, in an introductory note to his book, says :—

"It is of the humanity which India shares with the rest of the world, the hearts that beat always the same under whatever skin, the ideals that can never be choked by no matter what customs or religions, that this book is concerned with. India sees life through different windows than we do; but her eyes are as our eyes, and she has the same desires as we have. She has been nearly dead or sleeping for long, but at last she moves. She is awake or waking. Should it not be our task, our pleasure and our pride, to help her early steps along the path of conscious strength that leads to a national life such as that we have been proud of? And to do so must we not try and understand her? Have we ever tried? I do not think we have; but the time is coming when, unless we go hand in hand with her along the path to nationhood, she will desert us. Her destiny is calling her; shall we keep her back? We cannot keep her back. 'No one can be more wise than Destiny.' And if we try, who will suffer like we shall? For her sake and for ours should we not try to understand? This book is an attempt at a beginning."

The Way of Peace

THE WAY OF PEACE

By H. Fielding-Hall, Author of "The Soul of a People," "The World Soul," "The Hearts of Men," "The Passing of Empire," etc.

"Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto."

TERENCE.

LONDON: HURST AND BLACKETT LTD.
PATERNOSTER HOUSE, E.C. :: :: 1917

HN
371
F

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Common Sense	1
II.	Mother Earth	24
III.	Spacious Days	45
IV.	Decadence	70
V.	The Village	97
VI.	The Wine of Life	116
VII.	Love	138
VIII.	Marriage	156
IX.	Makers of Crime	176
X.	Justice	199
XI.	The Sovereign House	217
XII.	The Inward Light	239
XIII.	A Vernal Wood	263
XIV.	When War will end	276

THE WAY OF PEACE

CHAPTER I

COMMON SENSE

THE Soul of a people is its sense of community.

It is that intelligent view that sees that all the world, that all life, whether of men, or animals, or insects, is in fact one life, expressing itself in innumerable ways and in innumerable individuals, but still always and for ever one. Just as all water, whether in seas, in lakes, in rivers ; in drops, in steam, in dew, is one water, as all light and heat is one light and heat, as all electricity is one electricity, so all forms of life are but differing expressions in different forms of one great and pervading and eternal Life.

Thus is the whole world not merely akin but actually one. The sense of identity, however,

varies in strength according to the distance. That our surroundings and our friends and neighbours are really but parts of our greater self it is easy to perceive and to understand, because we only live by and through them. If you can imagine yourself alone in empty space you will see that your life has ceased, you have no longer any real existence. You cannot work, because there is nothing to work on, no external nature to cultivate and use and enjoy. You cannot love, you cannot hate, you cannot fear nor hope, nor exercise your senses or emotions, because there is no objective. You cannot even dream, for there is nothing to dream about. You have no laws, nor conventions, nor morals, because these are not abstract things ; they have no existence in themselves, but are what define your relations with the outside world and its relation to you. You would have no right nor wrong, for these also are relative and reciprocal and you would be alone. No matter how able you were, your ability would be worth nothing, because it can act only by and on the community. Wisdom and folly would lose their meanings. You would cease to exist.

The community, therefore, is your greater self, and you can live only in and through it. Its

success is your success and its failure is your failure. When a nation comes to disaster all members of it share in the disaster; when it succeeds and is prosperous all share in the prosperity. In and by yourself you can achieve nothing and be nothing.

Life, therefore, not being absolute, but action and reaction to the world about us, all the manifestations of life are the same. They are functions of the community of which we are a part. Its prosperity is ours, its happiness, its sorrow, its troubles, affect us and are ours. To be thoroughly healthy ourselves all our community must be healthy, to be efficient all must be efficient, to be gay all must be gay. Crime and poverty are diseases of the community, just as a gouty toe is a disease of the whole constitution.

Again, not only does man himself exist only in relation to the community, but the value of everything he possesses is relative and not absolute.

Of what value is gold to a man on a desert island? It can buy nothing, it is useless to him. What constitutes the value of land? An acre of land in the city of London is worth a great deal to-day. Why? It would be worth nothing were London a desert. Its value arises from the

fact that a great community lives on and about it. Its value is absolutely conditioned by that community and by its health or otherwise. It is a product of that community. Were London becoming bankrupt land values would disappear.

Agricultural land may be rich or poor, but even this is relative to the market, that is, the community. A piece of land, no matter how rich, is worthless if it have no market where its produce can be sold.

The individual with everything he is and he possesses has no value, no real existence, in and by himself, and consequently all institutions, all laws, all civilizations that are based on the individual are fallacious.

Now what constitutes a community large or small is the land. Primary communities that are natural and true are limited in size, are based on a small area of land and include all within that area. Humanity has its laws of crystallization, as have minerals, and it will not make crystals of over a certain size. These small crystals will combine into larger masses, but if you do not have the small aggregation, you can have none at all. It is just so with humanity. What binds a community together is that common interest and common knowledge which comes

from contiguity within a definite and not a large area.

You will see these laws exemplified to a certain extent in an army, which does not consist of a million men at the bottom and fifty thousand officers at the top, but of army corps, which are made of divisions, divisions are composed of brigades, and brigades of battalions. The real unit is the battalion, or regiment, as it is still commonly called, for although battalions are made up of companies and they of platoons, these latter are not real, separate organisms, but are part of the structure of the battalion. They are necessary to the structure of the battalion in this way. The primary cell in all human organisms is held together by the personal knowledge of all those composing it. A battalion is too big an unit, even a company is too big, and hence the platoon. Every man in a platoon knows everybody else intimately ; their interests are all one. But the personal knowledge extends more or less throughout the regiment. The regiment contains officers, non-commissioned officers and men.

And it is based on living together. What sort of a battalion would you have if the officers lived in Mayfair, the non-commissioned officers in the

suburbs, and the men in Whitechapel? They must live in contact with each other. If not, the men, having masters but no leaders, would soon form organizations of their own and choose their own leaders. That is just what the workers have done.

It is exactly the same with nations. Their natural human structure is the village* wherein all live near each other, all know each other more or less, and whose interests are in common. These villages are divided into wards; adjacent hamlets may coalesce into a village, and thus the inner structure is complete. Villages form counties, and counties form countries. Countries may be united into a Kingdom.

Without the village organism you can have no true organism at all, and no general sense of community. You can have no united effort, no mutual assistance, no real sympathy nor manners, nor gaiety, no true conceptions of right or wrong. You have but a chaos of individuals, ruled by other individuals ignorant of their needs and therefore careless of their condition. Such

* It will be understood that I use the word "village" throughout the book for both a country and an urban area. The word "parish" in its original signification would be clearer but for the ecclesiastical meaning now attached to it.

an aggregation has no soul and its artificial structure is bound to fall into ruins. So have done all nations and civilizations, and ours is bound to go the same way unless we change it.

The Burmese have, or had, these communities, and it is because of them that, notwithstanding that their larger aggregations were a failure, that their civilization is elementary and that they have suffered a great humiliation, they are the gay and sympathetic and human people that they are.

Each child is brought up to understand, not by mere maxims, but by personal observation and experience that the community is his greater self. There may be richer and poorer, wiser and simpler, differences of all kinds, but all are cells in one organism. No personal, nor class, nor religious idea must come between a man and his community, for such ideas are all false. They are injurious and dangerous. The greatest tolerance is given to all opinions and all acts provided they are not such as to hurt the well-being and unity of the community. That is the supreme test. No man is free to do that, nor to hold himself apart from the rest. Their institutions are free, because the sense of community takes the place of rigid rules which are never true.

It seemed to me, then, that the study I made of

the Burmese people was only an essay, and that what I would like to do later on, when I had retired and come to live amongst my own people, would be to write a similar book about them. I was aware, of course, of the far greater difficulties in writing of a complicated civilization like that of England than of a simple people like the Burmese, but still I could try. After all, beneath the varied appearances of this civilization there must be some community of thought and feeling, there must be some relationship between all the classes here, something that, notwithstanding appearances and differences, was common to all the people of England. I could study and find out.

And so for ten years since I came home, in town and country I have studied and observed, and what have I found? Did I find that there was anywhere that sense of community in all things which is the Soul of a people? without which, indeed, no nation as an unit can exist? I found just the opposite.

All sense of community was dead. In the towns as in the country villages the inhabitants were split into innumerable castes, based on land-ownership or on money, based on creeds Catholic, Church and Chapels, based on Party, Liberal,

Tory, Socialist, based on fanaticisms, temperance and other, and there was no sense of community. Each caste hated all the others and fought for ascendancy. There was unceasing argument upon all matters, with no chance of agreement, because they had none of them any true test of right and wrong. Abstracting themselves from reality and truth, they imagined abstract absolute principles, if relative to anything, then either to an imaginary "this world" and human nature "as it ought to be," or to a still more imaginary other world. As to accepting Nature as it is and basing their ideas on that, they would have none of it.

There was no sense of community and therefore no united action, no communal institutions at all. There were no village banks, no markets, bake-houses, baths, crèches, collections of eggs, poultry, fruit and vegetables, no co-operative butter-making, nothing. The land did not yield a tithe of what it should.

Here in England we could grow all the fruit and vegetables and dairy produce we need far fresher and finer than stale, imported stuff, but we do not. Living in country villages admirably adapted for fruit and vegetables I have had to buy Canadian apples, French plums, pears and cherries,

and Channel Island vegetables. At the same places I have seen apples left to rot on the ground, fine vegetable marrows and French beans fed to pigs, and people with gardens leaving them uncultivated because there was no way of disposing of the surplus.

I have seen innumerable cases of tenants refusing to improve their land because they were only tenants. "Why should I improve the house or the cottage, why should I plant fruit trees for the benefit of my landlord?" That is a common saying. There were no cottage industries, but the shops were full of the products of cottage industries from elsewhere.

There were nowhere any places for social meeting. With very few exceptions the clubs of the richer classes in towns had long ceased to have any social nexus. They were only places of refreshment. The fact that two men belonged to the same club did not justify them in speaking to each other. They might meet on the stairs daily for years, scowl at each other, sit near each other at lunch, anticipate each other with the evening papers, and remain strangers, almost enemies, in fact.

In the country it was worse. The isolation of life in the country in England is almost incredible.

Those pleasant little clubs which even the tiniest station in the East possesses, where both men and women meet and where amusements are got up, are unknown. I don't know why. People who out of England are friendly and clubbable, in England lose all sense of attraction towards each other and are isolated.

Among the poorer classes the isolation is not so great, but they also have no places of social meeting. The inns used to be the social centres of the villages, the foci of their common life, now they were become only drink shops. There were in consequence no amusements, no dancing, no singing, no music, no mutual understanding and solidarity. Life had with all classes and in all places become narrow, limited, unhappy. English people are naturally as kindly, as social, as gay, as intelligent, as sympathetic, as any in the world, but these qualities cannot express themselves except in community with others, and in England no communities exist. Everyone is thrown back into himself, or a very limited circle of his own class. He is educated at class schools and the rich man has class universities. Each class lives quite separated from all others. Stepney Causeway does not know,—cannot know,—South Kensington, nor the latter know Grosvenor Square.

The servant has long ceased to be a member of the family and as a rule no relation exists between mistress and maid but the inhuman relationship of money. Hence the servant difficulty. The ignorance, the narrowness, the loneliness of life, had become extreme because our greater self had shrunk almost to nothing.

And I found a great many other things I do not like to think about.

How could I, then, write about the Soul of the English ?

Nor was that all.

Every institution in the country had fallen into disrepute. The Upper House was almost abolished, the Lower House entirely discredited. The laws and the Courts were in all matters gravely unsatisfactory. Our industrial system had resulted in the dreadful poorer quarters of great cities and was the stage of continual war between Capital and Labour. The suffragettes had shown clearly what both men and women had felt bitterly for long, that the relations of the sexes in and out of marriage, socially and economically, were almost unbearable. Our whole social edifice was tumbling about our heads, and no one knew what to do.

Indeed, everyone seemed to think that nothing

could be done. Some said that we were naturally a stupid and inefficient people; others that it was the natural law of Empires and nations to die. "Men die," they said, "and so do all aggregations of men. Rome decayed and Spain decayed, and the same causes that ruined them will ruin us. All the symptoms are present. There is the growth of a great proletariat, there are the latifundia. There are *panem et circenses*, free trade and football. There is the growth of Imperialism with decay at home. There is exactly that feeling of despair which came over Rome with the establishment of the Empire. We are not exempt from the natural laws of growth and decay and we too must pass."

In the first of these I did not agree. Naturally, we are as intelligent as any race, but there is some obstacle to its development, some defect of organization which can be rectified.

That Empires must pass I admit, because Empires are unnatural things. It is not natural for one people to govern another. I am not sure it is good for either of them.

All Empires are the work of hereditary aristocracies and are accompanied by servitude at home. Now the proof of real ability to govern would be that it began at home.

But that nations and civilizations need pass I do not agree. There is no analogy between a man and a people. A people never dies. Athens has never been uninhabited though it is over two thousand years since Athens fell. England will always be inhabited by the English. If civilizations fall it is because their institutions are not true. True institutions founded on true ideas would adapt themselves to change and grow with the nation.

There yet is a third class of pessimists, and they are the most dangerous because they hide their pessimism under a loudly professed optimism. "Human nature," they say, "is in its essence sinful and there is nothing to be done with it. No institutions and no ideas are any use, no action can result in success. It cannot and will not rise to high ideals. We have set these ideals before it, hoping and striving for the best, but it will not conform. The world is by nature evil, we are all born in sin and all we can do is to endure our sufferings as best we can, and look forward to a future where there will be no nature human or otherwise. Only then can we be happy."

However, even on this hypothesis I am not so sure as to their happiness. If Nature be not

in that place they expect to find Him who designed Nature, and if they have found His work evil, will they find Him good? And how will He like their opinions of His work?

My own impression is that I am face to face with His work, and therefore in a sense with Him here and now without waiting for another world. I acknowledge no sacred book except the Book of Life, and no sacred history except how that Life gradually evolved all Nature.

Well, these are matters to be settled perhaps hereafter, in that future from whence no one has ever returned. Meanwhile, here and now he is but an ignorant and coward workman who lays the blame of his failures on his tools or his material. Our intelligence is adequate if we will but use it, and our material is admirable if we will but study it and learn to understand it. The only trouble is that men will not use their intelligence, they are afraid. And they exhaust themselves in finding ingenious and fine-sounding reasons for their foolishness.

When an architect plans a palace or an engineer designs a machine, he does not first imagine abstract principles or ideals, and try to enforce them on his materials. He carefully considers what he wants to achieve, that it be something

useful to humanity, and he studies carefully and minutely all his material and the means at his disposal. He finds out the crushing strain of brick or marble, the laws of equilibrium, the qualities of steel, the laws which govern the expansion of steam or petrol vapour, the possibilities of electricity and heat. Then he forms his designs. If he fail at first, as he is bound to do, he does not declare: "It is not my fault but that of the material. Walls ought not to fall down, material ought not to crush, timber should not break. Steam has no business to behave as it does. I left what is in my opinion an ample outlet, a perfectly ideal outlet, in fact, which I learned from an ancient book, but the steam made other illicit outlets, and when I securely plugged them up it burst the boiler and nearly killed me—Me, who had none but benevolent designs." He does not rebuild on the same discredited lines, hoping the material will in future behave better, nor does he sit down to wait till he is dead. He notes the laws he has learned and he amends his designs, he enlists Nature on his side instead of defying her, and he performs miracles.

So do our architects and engineers act and succeed; so have not acted our politicians, re-

formers and philanthropists, and therefore they have not succeeded. They have in the past built up edifices political and social which defied human nature, and when these all fell down they only thought of doing the same again. So have all institutions come to ruin, and the real cause is not human nature but the ignorance and bigotry of leaders, teachers and preachers. All Nature, including human nature, is good. The more I study and come dimly to understand it, the more wonderful it seems to me. In all its processes it seems to me a marvel of wise design.

And those very qualities which are usually denounced as its defects or weaknesses seem to me its greatest strength. It will not be bound by false laws or institutions. No matter how great the forces of repression, careless of denunciation and persecution, at any cost of suffering, it will not be bound in the chains of dogmas or tyrannies of any kind. Sooner or later it brings them into ruin.

What would have been left of humanity unless it had this quality? Life would long ago have ceased to be worth the living, and it would have ceased. The earth would have been desolate and its Maker's designs defeated. That is what

has been and still is attempted. My idea on the contrary is to co-operate with the Designer.

Life is eternal on the earth and rises anew out of the ruins of false civilizations. It will have true institutions or none. And in the end it will win. But the hour when institutions stagger to their fall is dark. So was it two years ago.

Then came the war, and after a little time England found a common purpose and a common will, to defeat the enemy. She had once more a soul, and from this community of desire, the only source of all good things, has come many beautiful happenings. So I was able to write about England, and I wrote "The Field of Honour" and "For England." Once more we have a common country dear to all of us for which to live and die, and so notwithstanding our sufferings we have gained much, for we are all together once more.

But it is "only for the war." In other matters nothing is changed. No solution has appeared. When the common enemy has been defeated, what will happen? When the common bond of danger is relaxed, shall we fall into chaos? Will our soul have disappeared? It seemed inevitable. For the old institutions have passed

away. They are dead and rotting, and we know not how to build anew.

But why should it be inevitable ? Three years ago it seemed quite impossible that the nation should be united in making war, yet we have recovered our unity. If we can do it for one purpose, why not for all ?

How then have we recovered our Soul ?

By the only means possible by which anything can be attained, by facing the facts of life as they are ; by throwing overboard all phrases, dreams, theories, formulas and dogmas, and looking life straight in the face ; by realizing that if we want anything we must get it ourselves ; and as we cannot get anything if we are divided, we must be united.

The only thing that unites is truth, seeing things squarely as they *are* and not as we are told they *ought* to be.

In the perplexity of the present, an old man looks back to his youth, when, as he thinks, life was very different, and so do nations in their trouble look back to former days. How often have I heard : " In Elizabeth's time this was a different country. In those ' spacious days ' England was Merrie England and we led the

world. We were a glad people and we sang; our musicians were the best in Europe. No one said then that life was not worth the living. Would that those days could return." And I thought to myself, Why not? If England was then all she is said to have been, there was a reason. And that reason was not an economical reason but an intellectual reason. Nations do not succeed on material things, which are but methods, but on spiritual things, that is on ideas. Beneath every institution, whether it be political, or social, or industrial, whether it be a House of Commons or a system of law, or the factory system, or the relationship of the sexes, there is an idea. Success and happiness in a nation come from true ideas in their institutions. In Elizabeth's time things are said to have gone well. Did England have then a Soul? Had she that sense of the unity of life which now she has not got, and if so, whence did it come and why did it disappear? Can it appear again?

All these questions I have answered in this book.

There is nothing to prevent our being again as happy as the Elizabethans, aye, and far happier, because theirs was but an imperfect

happiness. There is nothing to prevent our building up new institutions greater and more permanent than the old, because they will be truer. There is nothing to prevent our being a nation united in all matters. We can prevent war by removing the causes of war. In no other way can it be done.

Only we must achieve all these things ourselves. They will not happen by chance nor by the will of God, but by the intelligence and effort of man.

We have had a terrible lesson; are we not capable of learning and remembering the truths it ought to have taught us? Let us make a note of some of them so that we may never forget them again.

The safety and well-being of a nation cannot be secured by theories, formulas, words, whether spoken or written in laws or in treaties, ideals, prayers, or dependence on others, or by any means whatever except by facing facts as they are and preparing to meet them.

In the present state of the world, and probably for long to come, to have peace we must be a nation armed for defence.

In order to be securely armed, whether to defend ourselves in war or to attain wealth, and

happiness and freedom in peace, the whole nation must be organized, men and women.

In order that this organization be truly made, and when made that it is not misused either for conquests abroad or to produce slavery at home, we must have a Government that proceeds from the people, and not from class or party, or any section whatever.

This organization, whether of army or nation, to be successful must have a common purpose known to all and approved and desired by all. Blind obedience is no substitute for common intelligence and will and purpose. This is as true of the minor tactical movements of a company as of general ideas in the nation.

No one should hold power, or authority, or title or rewards except for his own proved merits. There must be perfect freedom not only for ability to rise, but for incapacity to fall.

Mutual confidence between officers and men can only be obtained by their living near together, and having contact in other matters than purely professional duties. So all classes should be neighbours in peace as in war, in pleasure as in work.

All these things are as true of a nation in its pursuit of happiness and health and well-being,

as in its provision for its safety; none of them obtain in any of our present institutions. They must all be rebuilt. And the principles on which they should be built are quite simple.

It will be a hard work and a long work and will not be done in a generation, nor without sacrifice. But if to save England from the enemy without the English of all classes have not hesitated to give treasure, and convictions and life itself, will they shrink from like sacrifice in order to subdue the enemy within, to retrieve the results of centuries of error? If so, then the war has failed to teach us what we ought to learn. We shall pass and cease to be. And we shall deserve it.

Surely we are men enough not to let that happen.

CHAPTER II

MOTHER EARTH

BUT before arriving at Elizabethan England, it is necessary to go back still further and show how that England came to be. For it did not spring suddenly into life, but was with its virtues and defects the result of antecedent causes. We must go back to the original village community and explain the idea on which it was founded, because that idea was a true idea, and it is because we have gradually lost it that England has reached her present state.

I am sorry if this chapter will seem dull to the reader. It is not dull to me. But I beg the reader not to skip it. Nothing can be understood of life to-day and the reforms we must make unless it be mastered, for it contains the base on which alone all true organization of nations in any matter can be built.

The original village community was the same

everywhere in the world. You could see twenty years ago in Burma villages whose constitution differed in no essential from that of early communities here, and which lasted here, though in gradual decay, until a hundred years ago. The small differences are due to climate and other local matters, the idea is a truth of humanity. All countries began in the same way because it is the only true way. No nations have continued in this way, and so all nations dissolved, and not until the village organisms were again healthy could new nations arise. And no nation will endure, no civilization have any value, that offends against this truth.

The first essential to any community, small or large, ancient or modern, is the land. It is the land on which it lives that gives it form and being; it is the land which gives the community its name. Englishmen are so because they live in England; Yorkshiremen because they live in Yorkshire; Londoners because they live in London, and so on down to the village. The difference between community and community is not race, nor customs nor language, but the land where they live.

Land to live on is the first necessity both for the individual and the community of which he

forms part. It it, moreover, the only true base of association. Other forms of aggregation, by caste, or wealth, or creed, or class, are false forms of aggregation. They are lateral layers and are based on untrue ideas. A true community is as much based on the land as is a tree, with roots, trunk, branches, leaves and flowers, and it is from the land it draws its life. A community of flowers divorced from its roots has no vitality. It dies. Thus to the formation of any community the land is the prime necessity. You cannot consider humanity and land as separate questions. They are one and the same.

And of the two the land is the prime necessity. For suppose a community entirely destroyed by, say, war or plague, it can be in time replaced by immigration, because humanity can increase to fill vacant places. But land cannot be increased, its extent is practically fixed, and if an area of land be lost by disappearing into the sea or into private ownership, that is an end of any community that stood on it until it can be redeemed.

Not only is a community an outcome of the land, but its health, its efficiency, its freedom, its laws and conventions, its whole organism, in fact, is based on the land.

For consider: even if it do not require land for producing its food, even if that can be imported, a community to be healthy, and progressive and free, must have healthy dwellings, good roads, ample sunlight and fresh air, grounds for recreation and other public needs, and the right to manage its own private affairs without interference.

All laws and conventions are the product of land because it is contiguity that renders them necessary. As I have already said, man alone in the world has none, because they are what define his relationship to others in contact with him. Political institutions are the same.

The earth is our Mother and from her do all things proceed. If she be not free, then nothing that proceeds from her can be free.

All this was very clearly seen by all early communities with that truth of vision that comes from intimate contact with the realities of life, unspoiled by false education; they saw that land being a common necessity could never be subject to personal ownership. He who owns the land owns also all that is on the land, including the community, and they intended to remain free. The land was originally cleared by the community; all land values were due to the

community, the village was founded by the community, every individual in it depended on the community for his safety and prosperity, therefore, the community must hold the land in trust for all its members.

You cannot honourably ask a man to sacrifice his life and treasure in defence of a land in which he has no share, and on which he has no rights. Communities do not now need to defend themselves against armed attack, only against economic attack, but nations do, and the truth remains the same. England has now all her able-bodied sons fighting for her by land or sea ; how many of those have any right in any part of that English land for which they fight and suffer and die except to a grave ? How many of them can go to any village in England and say, " I am a son of this village and I have a right to live here. I have a right to house room and to share in the village institutions ? " None of them. They suffer and die for a land that belongs to other people, and to any part of which they may only return to live on the sufferance of private owners. As to forming part of a community, there are no communities to form part of. That cannot continue.

Had the private ownership of land been

allowed by early men, no communities could ever have come into being, and at all times and in all places the health of the community varies exactly as its control over the use of land within the village boundaries. Where this ceases and private proprietorship becomes absolute, the community is dead. This has occurred nowhere in modern Europe so completely as in England, and here it has only become so in the last hundred years.

The idea, therefore, that underlay all communities was that the whole of the land belonged to the community. House sites were allotted by the village council, and the fence enlarged and new land taken in as required. A villager had an absolute right to any building he put up and a right to the site as long as he lived on it. He could also leave the building to his descendants or sell it, and the Council would not interfere unless from village necessity. But he could not sell the site or use it for other purposes. He could not put up a factory on it, or sell it to a stranger, or make it into a garden, without permission. No one could own two houses, living in one and letting another, no absentee could retain any rights during his absence, and if the Council required the land it must be given up

on payment of compensation for actual loss—not for the value of the land.

Outside the fence the original custom was that the village lands were divided into the following areas according to circumstances: an arable field, a grazing field and a forest. Every villager had a right to a section of the arable land allotted each year, to graze a certain number of animals, and to certain timber rights. There was no private proprietorship. But very soon difficulties arose. When a man has a different piece of land allotted each year he will not improve it, he will not plant fruit trees, for instance.

Therefore, while retaining their true idea intact, they altered their methods. Trees would be planted and the planter would own the trees and would sell them or hand them to his descendants, but the land on which they stood was still communal. I have seen many such trees. This, however, was not quite satisfactory, and with advance in agriculture further difficulties arose. Crops must be rotated, fields must be drained, and manured and fenced. No one would do this with a piece of communal field allotted each year.

So again while preserving their ideas, they altered their method. Land could be held per-

manently and bought and sold subject to the following conditions :

No stranger could buy land without permission ; you cannot have strangers interfering unless you know who they are.

No absentee could hold land. The Council has no power over absentees.

No one could hold more than he could cultivate ; tenancies were not allowed because tenants never get the best out of the land and tenants are not free men.

None of the village necessities, such as water supply, roads, access to rivers or the sea, must be subject to private rights of any kind.

None of the village amenities, such as recreation grounds, fresh air, and field walks, must be injured or done away with. The Council would always so rearrange things, if possible, so that private enterprise was not unduly cramped, but amenities are really necessities and they cannot be impinged. They are rights inherent to the community, and are unalienable even by consent, because one generation cannot disinherit the next.

All land still remained communal land in that the Council could resume it for village needs, paying compensation only, and could make

rules prohibiting, say, certain crops to be grown if in their opinion injurious to the village.

Any land left uncultivated for more than a certain period became communal land again, and all previous rights were extinguished without payment, for no village can afford to see its resources wasted.

With the aggregation of villages into kingdoms a new right arose, that of the State. The State had the right to tax all land and to take any land needed for State purposes without payment, except for compensation, for improvements, or disturbance. Otherwise, the communal rights remained.

This was the immemorial Common Law of land everywhere. It was so in England. It has never been altered by any legislation, and, indeed, it is difficult to see how it could be altered. It is, therefore, rightly the Common Law of England now. How in practice all communal rights were extinguished and the people disinherited is a curious story.

It begins with the Conquest of England by William the Norman, and its organization on the feudal system.

I do not say, of course, that even in Saxon England the village communities had remained

uninjured. There were nobles and ecclesiastics before William came. But the damage done was not great, and, practically speaking, the village communities existed as I have described.

The cause of the origin of the feudal system was as follows: When the Roman Empire broke up from internal decay, it left nothing behind it. Its whole system of Government was exotic and artificial, and when it fell nothing remained of any larger organization than the village. The people were civilized and degraded. There was chaos, and external foes who had not suffered from the demoralization of Roman rule invaded Roman Europe and ravaged it. The Northmen, the Danes, the Saracens, the Huns, the Magyars, set upon the defenceless and demoralized peoples that had formed the Empire and there was no defence. Able men arose now and then, such as Charlemagne or Arthur, and with their personalities as centres made kingdoms, but when they died the kingdoms broke up. Pagan peoples invaded that Christianized Europe, bringing in new life and vigour, only in their turn to fall under the spell. There was no organization above the village. Then the idea of the feudal organization arose, not by any means a new idea in itself, but somewhat so in its methods. This

was what William established in England, and its theory was quite simple.

All land was subject to State rights, and everyone who held land did so under the obligation to serve the State, either by personal service or paying taxes. This is a perfectly true idea.

To see that this was done, and, generally speaking, to organize this further organization, officials were appointed with authority to demand levies and taxes, to control the distribution of waste land and to administer justice. That is exactly our Indian system. These officials were under the control of the State, that is the King and Council, and were called Earls, Barons, Lords of the Manor and so on. They held at the will of the State, which could dismiss them. The son might succeed the father, but he had no right to do so. The titles were not hereditary any more than a Lord-Lieutenant, or General, or Judge is hereditary. They were a branch of Government, the Church was another branch; it also was subject to the central authority.

Under a strong king like William the system could work, under his successors it fell to pieces. The Barons declared that they held their powers and the land and titles by personal hereditary right, and repudiated any duties. The Church

acted similarly. When King John tried to enforce his authority on Barons and ecclesiastics, they got up a rebellion, called it the "Holy Army of God," and marched to Runnymede. They there presented the famous Magna Carta to King John, which under specious and sounding phrases meant only this: that no Baron could be dispossessed of his authority or land or title, no matter how great his dereliction of duty, except by his brother Barons, and no ecclesiastic could be tried for any offence except by other ecclesiastics. It was the destruction of all central government, of all control by the State, the setting up of the Barons as practically independent despots, and the establishment of the Church as a law unto itself. The King was the mere nominee or tool of the Barons. That was the real meaning of Magna Carta that has been so much praised. It was, in fact, one of those contrivances so common and so successful both in ancient and modern history where admirable sentiments are inscribed outside to conceal very different things within—that is to say, a booby trap. It was not the beginning of the liberties of the English people, but the end of them.

So arose hereditary titles; so arose also private property in land, and so began the destruction

of village communities. For a Baron who had repudiated the control of the State over the land would not be likely to accept the control of the Village Council. The Barons became the landowners and the cultivators were frequently only tenants. Where they retained their possession of the land they naturally, following the Barons, repudiated the Village Council.

It will be asked what the Law Courts were about to allow all this, and whether no justice was to be had in England. Could not the village communities enforce their rights ?

To this the answer is that the Courts supported and support this usurpation of land, and the history of how they come to do so is even more curious and instructive than the history of the Barons. It was not because the Courts were corrupt, though they were corrupt ; it was from far more dangerous causes than personal want of probity. They destroyed the true ownership of land on principle. This is the story.

In land, as in all other matters, there is in England no general law laid down by the Legislature. True it has passed innumerable Statutes, overlapping, contradicting, repeating each other in matters of detail, Civil and Criminal, but there is no system of law in any matter. Later on I

go into this more fully, as regards criminal and civil matters in general; here I will confine myself to the land.

There is not now and never has been any Statutory Law declaring how rights in land arise and what limitations they are subject to. When, therefore, judges had land cases to decide, they could not refer to any written code, they had no guidance from the State. In default of this they assumed that such a code existed either in ancient custom or in the sense of right and justice of the people generally, which would do as well, and indeed better. Now, as I will show later, this supposition is as regards most matters a fallacy, and such a method of making law by the will of judges is most injurious, yet as regards the land it was absolutely true. Such a code of ancient law did exist and was thoroughly well known to the people. It was founded on the strictest sense of right and justice, and it could easily have been ascertained. I have described what this code was.

But the Courts never discovered it or acted on it. Whether this was due to real ignorance or to a determination not to acknowledge a law so opposed to the desires of the governing class I cannot say. It may have been either. Judges

and lawyers as a rule know but little of the real things of life. They are in habit of mind very like ecclesiastics, and, like them, live in an artificial atmosphere where abstract individualistic theories of right and wrong take the place of knowledge of living, human relationships. Like ecclesiastics, their profession consists to a great extent in condemning other people for breaches of artificial laws, and both deplore human nature as evil. Indeed, much of our law is due to ecclesiastics, and there has always been a close connection and alliance between the two professions. For centuries the Chancellor of England was a bishop, and the Churches have always been the keenest opponents of law reforms. They opposed the mitigation of our savage penal laws in the last century, and they are still opponents of all the further reforms so urgently needed.

The Judges may therefore have been ignorant. On the other hand, belonging as the Judges did to the privileged classes, that ignorance may have been a wilful ignorance. Whatever the reason may have been there is no doubt about what they did. They took as their guide Roman Law, part of that great legacy of evil principles the Roman Empire bequeathed to the Western world, and they ignored the community entirely. The

Roman Law knew no village communities or the latifundia could not have arisen. English Law must do the same. Our Courts therefore held that the proof of ownership was occupation over a certain period and that such ownership was in practice absolute, even against the State. The only village rights they recognized were rights of way and rights over such land as still remained common land. Even these admitted rights were not considered as rights of that community. The right of way was held to be a public right, which is quite another matter, for the village community had no control over it, could not alter it or close it, for instance. A public right means really that no one has any right. It is negative, not affirmative. Rights in common land were individual rights and the individual could be bought out. In the eyes of the Judges the village as a community did not exist, for the Courts only recognize what has been established by law and not what has been established by nature. The Legislature had never recognized the village community as a corporate body for very obvious reasons, and therefore the Courts could not recognize it. Ownership of land became practically absolute.

The village community, the only true owner

because maker of all land values, was not recognized. It legally did not exist. Moreover, the State power over the land also became a shadow. When, for instance, later on, land was wanted for the national purpose of making railways it had to be paid for exorbitantly, and we still suffer for this in our high railway rates. According to all customary law and all sense of right and justice it should have been taken on payment for improvements or for compensation for actual loss.

The destruction of the village community was begun, and with it all possibility of freedom, of progress, of social unity, of the true relationship of people, of all happiness. The man who owns the land owns all on the land. The English people were disinherited.

So came revolts and peasant wars, ruthlessly repressed, and increasing misery. The nobles were absolute and the Church was absolute. With the village communities passed not only economic and material freedom, but spiritual freedom. For those warm and living bonds which unite all belonging to one community and all communities to each other were substituted the false and frigid moralities of an individualistic religion. The soul was squeezed out of the English people.

I can well understand the despair, for I have seen it and felt it myself. All that Soul of which I wrote in "The Soul of People," is being gradually crushed out of the Burmese people. Our systems of law and administration in India have the same underlying principles as those in England, are based on the same fallacy of the individual and not the community. In "The Passing of Empire" I have explained how this is being done in Burma as it has already been done in India. It is disastrous in the present; it can but be more disastrous in the future till the rebound comes. But the rebound takes long.*

In England the misery steadily increased for about three hundred years, but at length human nature vindicated itself, as it always does. The nobles failing in their attempted conquests of France and Scotland, set upon each other. They formed into parties and strove for mastery. So came the Wars of the Roses and at last the practical extinction of the nobles. That was one great relief. And following on the delivery from the aristocracy came delivery from priests.

* Since writing these words I have learned that in Burma a beginning has been made towards restoring the autonomy of the villages. I cannot too earnestly congratulate the Government on its new departure.

That great minister, Thomas Cromwell, the only statesman we have ever had, to the delight of the people not only dissolved the monasteries but he sought to free the people from all the superstitions that weighed so heavily on them.

For it must be remembered that Protestantism, which had been steadily growing in England, was not a religion. It was a protest against all ecclesiasticism and a declaration of the right of private judgment. It is a false use of the word "Protestant" to apply it to any religion or any creed. It was a return to sanity and reason, and the people generally accepted it with delight. They mocked at all priestcraft.

According to the complaint of the Bishops "Light and lewd people" who were, in fact, most of the men of light and leading, headed by Thomas Cromwell and comprising nearly all the people, "were not ashamed to say that the High Mass was but a piece of bread, a pretty piece Round Robin; the Holy Chrism was but the Bishop of Rome's grease or butter; it was as lawful to christen a child in a tub or in a ditch at home as in a Church, and Holy Water was but a thing conjured. To pray to the Saints was as useful as to whirl a stone against the wind. High Mass

and Matins were but howling and conjuring. And there were serious complaints as to plays in which the sacred beliefs and Persons of the Christian system were ridiculed." So did the English people cast off for a time some of their most grievous burdens, and the great outburst of life and joy and patriotism, of good manners and kindly feeling, of prosperity and success, which occurred in Elizabeth's reign was the result.

But it must be remembered that the causes which led to this outburst of exuberant life occurred in and before the reign of Henry VIII. With the downfall of Thomas Cromwell at the hands of a cabal formed of priests and a few of the remaining nobles the reaction began. The glory of Elizabeth's reign owed nothing to Elizabeth nor her ministers. She was a vain, headstrong woman, and Burleigh was an intriguer and schemer rather than a statesman. His policy was reactionary. Instead of being a great minister he was one of the worst England has ever had. But as a tide continues to flow after the influence that caused it has passed, so it is with humanity. The results of the policy pursued in the later years of Henry VIII. and during Elizabeth's reign are seen in the troubles of the Stuarts, that brought forth another Cromwell.

So does one generation sow and another reap. We are all part of organisms that have an eternal life and our existence is relative not only to our own generation but to all preceding and all succeeding generations.

CHAPTER III

SPACIOUS DAYS

THE old ecclesiasticism had been abolished, and the new, though established by law, had not yet subdued the people.

Feudalism was dead and the feudal lord had passed away. The few nobles who remained of the old stock found themselves in a new world which would not tolerate their oppression, and the new nobles created by Henry VIII. had not yet lost touch with that real world from which they sprang. Privilege and caste were for the time dead, and another spirit had taken their place. "At no time in English history was the co-ordination of all classes so recognized to be an absolute necessity." The soul that made the Elizabethan era, as all great eras, was the sense of community. It proceeded from the people and it inspired all the institutions over which they had control. It did not inspire the Government nor any of

the institutions which it created and controlled, but the long civil wars and the decay of feudalism had greatly reduced the power and influence of Government. The communities in town and country had been able for some time to develop themselves along true lines of growth comparatively unmolested. As Dr. Jessop says, speaking of the fifteenth century, "our England was divided into some thousands of geographical areas which were called vills or townships (we now call them parishes) varying greatly in extent; but each of these townships was not only a geographical but a civil, an ecclesiastical, a social, and we may add a political unit, enjoying a very large measure of self-government, and in many instances enjoying a sort of constitution of its own.

"The inhabitants were human, but nevertheless these people in the old township managed their affairs with surprisingly little friction, and, above all, they were unanimous in regarding the land comprehended in their several townships as in some sense the property not of one or two landlords, but as the property of all the members of the village community."

They had, that is to say, the sense that they were all members of one organism, that the health of the organism, and any part of it, depended on

the health of all parts of it, and that ultimately all property, whether in land or otherwise, was rightly used, and all effort was rightly directed, only when the result was the benefit of the organism as a whole.

And as a corollary they had this: that man also, with his intelligence, his emotions, his needs, his hopes, his fears, is a complete unit, a cell, and that to obtain the best from him you must satisfy all the calls of his intelligence, all the needs of his body, all his emotions, all his hopes and fears, because if you starve him in any one particular you destroy his balance and he becomes distorted and comparatively useless. He must be *totus teres atque rotundus,* or you cannot get good out of him.

Thus the village community, although sorely distressed by its enemies, had never died, and now again it rose and made vigorous efforts towards a newer and greater life. It could not, of course, attain full freedom, because many of the evil influences which had oppressed it remained, although in a lesser degree. The Government remained, the bad laws, civil and criminal, remained. Almost every offence was punishable with death, and brutal executions were common sights. The country was picketed with gibbets

whereon men hung in chains. The public flogging of men and women was a daily spectacle and in the country it was the rector or vicar who superintended the performance. Civil redress for wrong was practically unobtainable, for not only were the Courts corrupt but, what was worse, they were actuated by wrong principles, as they are now. Therefore men took the law into their own hands.

And further, burnings alive and other savageries committed by the Churches had been common and were still to be seen. With such daily lessons from Church and State as to the value they placed on life is it a wonder that the people generally to some extent followed their example ?

The material civilization of the country was low compared with to-day. The larger houses were generally built with wooden frames, the squares filled in with lath and plaster, while some of the smaller ones were of mud. The roofs were of thatch or tiles, the floors of stone, the windows small but of glass. But it seems that there were comparatively few huts, for the people lived together in families in a way that has long ceased. With the big landowner would live his secretary, his doctor, some relations, pages, and maidens from the families of neighbouring gentry, village

boys and girls under domestic training, in fact, a community of itself. Apprentices lived with their masters over the shop or workroom, employer and employees, farmer and labourers not merely worked together but lived together, and their connection was far other than the purely monetary one of to-day. "The cottages of the peasants (small farmers) consisted usually of but two rooms, the outer for the servants, the inner for the master and family."

The streets were not lit and they were not usually made or paved, nor was there any conservancy. The water supply was from the stream which ran through the village, or from wells. Means of communication were so bad that carriages could hardly be used. The poor walked, the richer rode. Goods came and went on pack-horses or pack-oxen. There were few shops, and many articles which we now consider necessaries were then unobtainable. There was but a "hedge" school, and most of the poorer classes could not read nor write. There were no newspapers, no telegraph, no post, no banks.

But even materially things were not so bad as may be supposed, because the people refused to be dependent on other countries, and used

their own resources to the utmost. It is true there were hardly any shops such as we have now, full of imported and factory-made goods, but households in those days provided things for themselves better and fresher. For the rest, there were the regular markets where the farmers' wives and daughters brought their dairy produce, and where home-made linens, embroideries, and the products of cottage industries were sold. The wives of the gentry, from the highest down, did not disdain to go regularly to market and to acquire such general knowledge as was necessary to market well. Market days meant social intercourse as well as business.

Of the innumerable things now imported and sold in the shops, how many are really necessary to even a high degree of comfort. There were no Canadian apples, West Indian bananas, French plums and cherries, or tinned fruits or jams, but there was fruit grown locally in all the gardens and made into preserves by the housewives. There was no chemist's shop filled with patent medicines, synthetic drugs and imported scents and soaps. The Elizabethans did not have a craving for drugs, and they culled herbs in the woods and grew them in gardens for their necessities. They distilled their own scents,

their lavenders and rose water, and made their own soap. They wove their own baskets, used fibre for string, dipped their own candles in tallow or bees-wax, and cured their own hides. They spun and they wove. The long winter evenings were not for them times of enforced idleness, but of indoor work. They would have disdained to be dependent on foreign countries for things they could either do without or for which they could find home substitutes. "Why," they said on one occasion, "do we allow foreigners to import oranges and take away in return our good wheat and wool? Have we not our own fruits?" They stopped the importation.

Neither were they without news. Of all the news daily delivered to us in newspapers, how much is really of any interest or value to us? Very little. Newspaper reading is for the most part only an acquired taste. The Elizabethan got plenty of news from the travellers who came through, from news letters and from private letters. Much of this was, no doubt, incorrect; how much of to-day's news is correct—that is to say, is so expressed as to convey a correct impression? The Elizabethan's interest was more in local affairs, which is better.

There was little travelling about for pleasure.

If you have pleasure at home you do not need to seek it abroad. Much of the travelling of to-day is but an expression of the weariness of life at home. In Elizabethan days life at home was not wearisome nor mechanical.

And banks such as we have to-day, whether "savings banks" or other, are, as you will see when I come to the subject of village banks, doubtful blessings. The Elizabethan when he made money may have buried it sometimes, but usually he used it for improving his land, or house or business, or he lent it to his neighbour. There was no taint of usury about this, as why should there be? Nowadays the man who has a surplus either invests it in some shares, generally outside his village, often outside his country, or he deposits it in a bank which takes it to London and uses it in international gambling. Thus, the country-side is bled white of money, and no capital is available.

Our material progress of to-day is, therefore, not all advance, and when we come to the social and spiritual condition of the Elizabethan, the advantage is all the other way.

Much of the land had passed into absolute private ownership, but the sense of community amongst all classes mitigated to some extent

this wrong tenure of land, for the landowners felt that their interests were bound up with that of the village. Much land still remained communal, and the village rights to fresh air, and to recreation grounds, and to field walks within their own village boundaries, was acknowledged. Where it was not acknowledged it was enforced.

When in the sixteenth century the landowners in Hoxton made fences and dug a ditch that prevented the young men shooting and ancient persons walking abroad for pleasure in the fields, the Londoners tore down the fences and filled up the ditch. "It is coming to this," they said, "that no Londoner is able to go out of the city but along the highways," and this they would not tolerate. So, although there was a great struggle about it, and the matter went up to the Council, they got their way. The city stood solid for its rights, and even the landowners could not prevail against it. What would those free Elizabethans say if they came back to-day and saw great areas, including the whole lands of many adjacent villages, covered with houses, if they saw generation after generation growing up divorced from all recreation grounds, all pure air, all country walks, disinherited of their indefeasible right to all things that go to the

making of healthy citizens? What would they say if they came to even country villages and saw the village roads and village streets made into racing tracks for motors, with the children cowering behind boards in the doorways? What would they say if they were told that there were no recreation grounds and hardly any field walks? And what would they do?

But in those days there were field walks everywhere and recreation grounds. The young men were trained in archery and other exercises so that they should develop their muscles and their sense of comradeship with their fellows. "Every man between 17 and 60 must keep a bow and shoot regularly at the butt at 200 yards and not less. For every boy between 7 and 17 his parents must provide a bow. After 1541 every citizen of a city borough or market town was encouraged to keep a gun and practise." And although the feudal system as a system was now dead, there was evidently some general form of military organization and discipline, because the militia mobilized to resist the Spanish invasion numbered 117,000 men. If you consider that the population of England including Wales was little over a tenth of what it is now, and that there were no railways or

other mechanical aids to mobilization, you will see that this was a large force. There were but few nobles in this organization, mainly it was officered by knights and new men, that is to say, men of understanding and experience. "I will have the gentlemen pull and haul with the mariners," said Drake. "I would like to see the gentleman who will not put his hand to a rope."

Life was then much more social, and the duty of class to class was recognized. The small squire and the lesser gentry lived in or near the village, and were interested in all its concerns. They had their meeting-place at the village inn, that great and essential village institution of which I shall have much to say later, and they knew all the villagers. They were proud of their village, proud to be of it, proud to do what they could to help it, knowing it was helping themselves. They were all interested in the village school, and if any boy showed himself clever he never lacked a patron to help him to the big grammar school in the county town and then to the university, *for the honour of the village.* For everyone then was proud of his village, and to be a citizen of London was accounted an honour that amounted almost

to a dignity. There was reason. But how much reason has the average Londoner to be proud of it to-day? What does London mean to him of the East End, for instance? What the squire and other gentry did for the boys and men their wives did for the girls and women of the village. They took them into their households and educated them—a real education in matters of life, not accomplishments. The villagers repaid all this in friendliness and help and extra efficiency.

And what the lesser gentry were to the village the greater gentry were to the county. They associated themselves intimately with all the local life about them. They lived not in London or abroad, but on their estates. Their work lay there and their pleasure also, so that it was a matter of great importance to them that their neighbourhood was prosperous and that they were popular. They dealt with the larger politics, co-ordinating village effort, composing inter-village quarrels, being in fact the centre about whom the greater organism of the county grew. They were the link between the village and the Government, the interpreter of each to each.

They stood up for their neighbours with the Government, and gave them such protection

and help as was needed. They filled their houses with the sons of the squires round, so that those sons should have a training in knowledge and politeness. What they did for the sons their wives did for the daughters of the squires. There were then no finishing schools for girls, but these great houses were far better than any finishing schools because they trained in real life. To get a wife from the household of Lady X. or Lady Y. was considered a great piece of good fortune.

They kept troops of actors and musicians, and through them new ideas from abroad came into the country. They were veritably a part of the life about them, and it was their pride to so consider themselves.

And what kept all this society sweet and healthy was the continuous current up and down. Rank counted for nothing; what did count was ability. New men were always rising and old men falling. There are no chosen races or families on this earth who are able men from father to son. The contrary appears to be the invariable rule—that a family rises, produces its greatest member and then declines again even below the average. Therefore there is nothing more necessary to the healthy life of a

State than that ability should rise, and conversely that incapacity should fall. No State can afford a dead weight at the top kept there by artificial means. It results always in disaster.

All the great men of Elizabeth's time—as of any other great time—were new men. And if great men at other times are wanting, the reason, no doubt, is that there is no chance for them to rise. Thomas Cromwell, the great statesman of Henry VIII.'s time was the son of an innkeeper; Raleigh's father was a small country squire; Drake was born in a cottage and his parents were unknown; Frobisher's father was a Welsh adventurer; Cecil's grandfather was a risen man; Walsingham's ancestor was a cordwainer; Bacon's grandfather was a sheep reeve, and so you might go on. It was the same with literature and music. So the Elizabethans sought out ability where it was to be found, and made the most of it.

Frequently orphans were adopted—a much better system than that of great soulless charities as we have now.

They were a busy people those Elizabethans. There was no leisured class, there was no semi-leisured class, there was no retired class. They worked all their lives and were glad to do so.

And in this hive of workers women took their part. It was not then considered that to be a "lady" you must be idle and ignorant. There was no great host of women with no work to do as there is now. The Elizabethan women were able women, understanding life, and worthy helpmeets to their husbands.

"It was the duty of a woman to be skilled in medicine, in herbs and how to grow and use them, in cookery, in distilling scents and strong waters, to be a competent brewer and know all about wines. She should understand dairy work, spinning and weaving flax, and dyeing. She should know how to superintend her household and how to educate her servants in all matters.

"In big households all bread must be baked at home, all beer home-brewed, all vinegar and mustard home-made. There was a regular economy.

"In small farm households the duties of a well-conducted housewife required that she should sweep the house, provide the meals, tend the dairy, swine and poultry, bake bread, brew ale, spin, weave, winnow the corn, make malt, wash and wring, make hay, and in time of need help to load muck, drive the wain and load hay. She went to market with the dairy and poultry and

corn, and rendered account to her husband, as he will to her if he go marketing."

Marriage was a joint stock business, and the intelligent women of those days were no mean help to their husbands and a great cause of their success. Naturally, they had the full trust and respect of their husbands.

"Women were admitted to guilds and could trade and plead of their own right if they were married."

It was a custom also in those days that girls should not enter on marriage entirely dependent on their husbands, but that they should have dowries. Fathers dowered their daughters, mistresses dowered their maids, and there were charities that provided for poor girls that they, too, should bring something to the starting of the household. And despite the foolishness of the laws, these dowries did remain in the woman's hands. Public opinion would not have tolerated the husband appropriating them. Wedding presents, too, were not a mere social tax of trifles, but serious contributions to the new household.

Sometimes, of course, this custom of dowries led to the abuse of parents marrying their children purely for monetary reasons, but that

it could be abused by ignorant people is no evidence that the custom was not a proper one.

And love in those days had greater empire than now. The Elizabethan period in England, as all periods of freedom gained after long repression, saw a great increase in the emotion called love, in the attraction of sex for sex. This emotion, of which I have much to say in a subsequent chapter, is so intimately connected with life and all the functions of life, courage, gaiety, humanity, artistic appreciation and mental ability, that it cannot be considered apart. If you suppress or confine one you injure the others. A free and spacious life is accompanied always with needs of outlet for this emotion both in men and women, far wider than the one narrow and artificial channel allowed by its enemies, the ecclesiastical authorities. And it has always taken them. A conventional and enslaved age, unable to see and think for itself, persecutes as far as it can those who break the conventions, forbids divorce and does its best to ruin the children of unions not "sanctified by the church." Wise generations, unable as yet to alter these evil laws, condone breaches of them that are not injurious to the community, and make the best of them. To them the test of a true

marriage is not that a form of words had been said, but a truer and more spiritual test. And so with other matters. That was what the Elizabethans thought, and if you read the wealth of love poetry of that day, and the sweetness and sincerity of its sentiment, you will understand how it arose. Shakespeare was a child of his age, as are indeed all great writers. We have no Shakespeare now.

Those were days of much social intercourse, and the centre of village life was the inn.

There would be some bedrooms for guests, and a parlour and a taproom—possibly other rooms as well, but it was not regarded in the least like our hotels or "pubs" are now. It was not in the first place either a place for strangers nor a place for drink, it was the village club.

It was where the village worthies met in the evening for companionship and to discuss affairs. The squire would not disdain to come, and maybe squires from the neighbourhood. The retired officer or seaman came, the wool-stapler, the doctor, and other gentry. They might have a room for themselves on certain nights. In other rooms here, or in the other inns, other circles were formed. They drank ale it is true, but that was incidental. Their purpose was society. And

this society was continually being mixed together, and there were always strangers travelling through, so that while classes did not fuse, they did not crystallize in separate layers.

There was little drunkenness, in the first place because an organized and regular society, no matter of what class, will not tolerate frequent drunkenness, as it destroys the amenities of the meeting, and secondly because they drank ale or wine. Spirits were then only known as medicines, and the heavily-hopped stupefying beers of to-day were not yet introduced from Holland.

The real old English ale was a malted, unhopped drink like those of the Continent to-day, wholesome, slightly exhilarating, but of which few men could hold enough to get drunk. There were, of course, strong ales, but the ordinary ale had but little alcohol in it. It was locally brewed and did not keep well. It was very cheap because there was no excise. It was of good standard because it was tested occasionally. There is no more wholesome nor more pleasant drink than ale newly made, and it was popular and deservedly so. Both sexes drank it. Besides this there were for the quality wines both imported and locally made, for much wine—real grape wine—was made then in England. Essex

was the principal vineyard. There was canary sack and malvoisie. None of these were doctored or improved. There were no aerated waters with their depressing effect on the heart, and no tea or coffee with their nerve irritation.

As far as strangers went "the inns were, as a rule, well kept, and were considered better managed than those on the Continent. Each guest who could pay for it was lodged in a well-furnished chamber amply supplied with clean linen, and he held the key of his room. If he lost anything the host was responsible."

The food was good and at meals all classes sat together. It will not be forgotten how in Chaucer's tale a knight did not disdain to sit with a miller, a cook and a ploughman. This was somewhat before Elizabethan times, it is true, but this matter had not greatly changed by then, nor, indeed, did it till much later. Readers of Dickens will appreciate how even a century ago the artificial and absolute division of classes had not hardened into what it is now.

And the inn, being the centre of village society, was the place where games, festivals and dances were arranged. Dances were common in those days, whether in the big room of the inn or in a barn or, in the summer, out of doors. There

was always plenty of music available. In Elizabeth's time English composers had a great reputation not merely at home, but also abroad, and English instrumentalists were held to be the best in Europe. English bands toured abroad and were greatly appreciated. There was a fashion of music. "Not only was it a necessary accomplishment for ladies and gentlemen, but even the City of London advertised the musical abilities of boys educated at Bridewell and Christ's Hospital as a mode of recommending them for servants, apprentices, or husbandmen. Tinkers sang catches, milkmaids sang ballads, carters whistled; each trade, even the beggars, had their own songs; the base viol hung in the drawing-room for the amusement of waiting visitors; the lute, cittern or virginals, for the amusement of waiting customers, were the necessary furniture of the barber's shop. They had music at dinner, music at supper, at weddings, funerals, by night, by dawn, by day. He who felt not in some degree its soothing influence was viewed as a morose and unsocial being to be regarded with suspicion and mistrust." And although some of this was only fashion or pose, yet beneath that there lay a real love of music amongst all classes, a sense that life goes

best to rhythm, that it makes joy still more joyful and sorrow easier to bear. "So that when one who goeth barefoote strike his toe upon a stone and maketh him to bleed and hurteth hym sore, it is well done that he and his fellows begyn then a songe, or else take out of his bosom a bagge pipe for to drive away with music the hurt of his fellow."

There are people to-day who tell you that we are not musical. We are as we always were, but now what opportunities have we got? What music has the village now? It is forbidden in the inns.

As a necessary accompaniment to music and singing there was dancing. There were frequent dances, maypole dances, morris dances, jigs, hornpipes, all sorts of dances. As the boys were all encouraged to shoot with the bow and practise other arms, so girls were all expected to dance. A famous performer of the country-side was old Hall of Herefordshire, who was born soon after Henry VIII. came to the throne, and was still at his play in 1609, though ninety-three years of age, "giving the men light hearts with thy pipe, and the women light heels with thy tabor. Oh, wonderful piper! Oh, admirable tabor-man!"

And remember that these dances were often not class dances; all danced together, and no lady had any shame to be dancing in the company of rustics. Manners were good in Elizabeth's time because the community of life was felt as a reality. We were then, by the admission of foreigners, the most polite people in Europe. The Elizabethans were courteous without servility, friendly without familiarity, humorous without injury to the feelings of others. There is probably no better test of the ideas that animate a nation at any time than its manners. For manners are in small things what laws and conventions are in greater things; they are the expression of the relationship of individuals to each other. Out of a sense of common humanity and the absolute necessity of each to all, arises a respect for your neighbour, and at the same time a desire to be on good and friendly terms with him no matter what his rank may be. To run a barbed wire fence about yourself is an admission that you do not know how to behave with other people, and so must keep them off. And it is destructive to all real sociability. Yet gaiety is one of the most necessary things.

"A merry heart goes all the day, your sad tires

in a mile-a." Efficient England will be Merrie England, but a lantern-jawed generation are good for nothing. Gaiety in a people is like the bloom on a girl's cheek, it is a sign of health, and nothing but health will give it.

In matters of religion, no matter what creeds and observances were forced on the Elizabethan by authority, his creed was a simple one and may be read in his acts.

The Elizabethan in this as in other matters was a clear-sighted and downright man. He saw the world, that it was made by design, and he called the Designer of each and every part not the Devil but God. He saw that if well and rightly used it was good, all of it, capable of great returns in the way of happiness. He was glad to be alive. As to the future, no man has ever returned to tell us about it, but he was sure that the true and only claim to favour with the Designer, and to promotion hereafter, was to have made the best of the present for himself and all about him.

Happiness and well-being are attainable in life for everyone, but only by clear thinking, and strong and united action. As Voltaire said of his successors, the Englishman knew very well that miracles never happened, and that prayers

had no effect but to numb and bewilder the minds of those who practised them ; if miracles were necessary they must be accomplished by the intelligence, the devotion and the self-sacrifice of men. It is a simple creed, and no one who has done good work at any period in history has had any other.

The Elizabethan was patriotic. The sense of love and devotion to country was never so strong in all classes, and this, like all the rest, arose from the sense of community in the village. A great patriotism is built on smaller patriotisms. If a man does not comprehend his village, and how for its health all classes must co-operate, neither will he comprehend his country.

CHAPTER IV

DECADENCE

IT is easy to see that had the ideas which penetrated and created the Elizabethan people been able also to inspire the Government and those round it that England of to-day would never have arisen. Had the governing class been able to see life as truly as the people, and been animated with the same humanity, national life would have proceeded on very different lines. There would have been a Code of Land Law embodying in Statute Law what was really the Common Law of the realm. All private rights in land would have been declared subject to the prior right of the community and of the State. The great land lords would have disappeared. No one would have owned more than he occupied and no tenancies, or only very limited tenancies, would have been legal. The community would have been legally

constituted and its rights defined. It would have had full power to protect itself and prevent any of the present abuses growing up. It would, for instance, have limited the area of the parish that might be built over, so as to secure fresh air, recreation grounds and contact with nature for all its people. It would have regulated the streets and it would have allowed no slums. No east end and west end could have appeared, as all employers would have been obliged to live in the parish where their works were situated. If they made smoke with their factory chimney, they themselves would have to help consume it. Instead of the present terrible cities there would have been congeries of little garden cities, each of which contained all classes in close companionship. Probably each group would have a centre wherein the municipal authorities would have ruled. There would thus have been no division between rich and poor, between employers and employed.

Money made in the community would have remained in the community till its needs were satisfied. The village inns as centres of the social life of the community would have been jealously preserved. There would have been no hereditary aristocracy and no House of Lords.

The House of Commons would have proceeded directly from these village communities, as I explain later, and it would have truly represented the whole people.

There would have been no State Church, and a true system of education, based on the truths of humanity and its essential unity, would have been instituted which would have made religious education and controversy impossible.

The whole of the Courts, Civil and Criminal, with all their laws and procedure, would have been swept away and a true system evolved.

So England would have still been Merrie England, full of life and energy and hope, full of humanity and kindliness, of music and gaiety, of good manners and geniality. We should have been so strong that no one dared attack us, so happy and so busy at home that no foreign venture would have tempted us. Even the population question would have settled itself. But, unfortunately, the very reverse took place.

The reaction began, as I have already said, in Henry VIII.'s reign. One nobility had been killed, he began to create another; one ecclesiastical tyranny had been abolished, he instituted another. Burleigh made the penal system even worse than it had been by introducing

torture. The communal lands were by degrees all enclosed and the communities choked. Everything made for reaction, and so with ebb and flow it has continued ever since, till the soul has been squeezed out of England even more effectually than under the feudal system.

But instead of following the current of history from then till now it will be more convenient to give the main influences which have produced the England of to-day, because it is those influences we have to combat if we would have a regenerated country. They are all forms of the same error that man exists to himself alone and not by and through the community.

The wrong system of land tenure, the evil laws, civil, matrimonial, and criminal, and the wrong procedure in all our Courts, I have already mentioned, and as I deal with them at length later I omit further reference now. There remain the hereditary aristocracy, the House of Commons, Religion, the Union with Scotland, and the decadence of women, all of which have contributed to our misfortunes.

* * * * *

In the ideal of the Socialists, of a State wherein there is neither rich nor poor and all are at a dead

level, I have no belief whatever. It would destroy all incentive to effort, and be completely inhuman. Rich and poor, provided that no one is so rich and no one so poor as to be injurious to the community, are essentials of organic life. That a man who has deserved well of his country should have a life title, if he cares for such a thing, is also harmless. Further, that a family or a number of families should, if it can do so in fair and open competition, by service to the State, generation by generation maintain themselves in authority and dignity, could be fraught with nothing but good to everyone. They give stability and strength.

But an hereditary aristocracy is quite a different matter. Despite the efforts of innumerable apologists, from the Jewish Chroniclers down to the Eugenists of to-day, ability of no kind is proved to be hereditary. There are no chosen people. Indeed, with the exception of minor details of physique, such as blue eyes, no rule of heredity in any matter, physical or mental, has been discovered. For every instance of apparent descent of qualities from father to son a dozen instances of the negative can be shown. Napoleon the First was a marvel of capacity. His father was a nobody; his mother a haughty and clever

woman. One brother was able, all the other brothers and sisters were, if anything, mentally under the average. Yet they had the same parents. Napoleon left two sons, but neither was even able. On the contrary the rule seems to be, as I have already said, that there is a sort of natural justice in these matters ; great men spring from hitherto undistinguished stocks and the descendants of great men fall below mediocrity.

Further, every system of artificial breeding, that is to say, of limiting marriage to class and interfering with selection by love and attraction, which are nature's means of indicating fit mates, results in deterioration. Our racehorses, prize cattle, dogs, garden flowers, and so on, show an increase in size and beauty in certain specimens—not by any means in all, for the waste is enormous—but they are deficient in stamina and intelligence. They are, moreover, infertile and die out.

It would seem, therefore, that the descendants of great men are not the best fitted for authority, but the worst, and history confirms this.

In addition to this the very setting aside of certain men as a caste apart has injurious effects. It leads to the assumption that a man's fitness for power lies neither in his ability, his knowledge, nor his experience, but in the fact of his

being born. It creates totally false standards. Men of such castes are brought up in an artificial atmosphere and are full of artificial ideas. They lose touch with humanity and its reality because *ex hypothesi* they don't belong to it. They become indifferent to home conditions and only thirst for conquest abroad. Then at last disaster comes, and the people have to build up anew. That is the history of all hereditary aristocracies. They make most of the wars in their thirst for Empire, yet what does the people generally gain by Empire? Nothing that I know of. The profit of the increased trade, if there be such, goes into the hands of the few rich, not the many poor, and that money is invested abroad instead of at home. Every people has need to employ all its energies and all its capital at home, but under Empire the home country is neglected.

So in three hundred years the aristocratic Government of England has built up a great Empire abroad while, since the final decay of the village communities a hundred years ago, the English land is undeveloped; and English cities have been built, consisting to a considerable extent of slums and mean streets where men cannot attain their true development.

Even if hereditary legislative power be

abolished, should hereditary titles remain much of the evil is still retained. The creation of a class apart from the general mass of the people is still injurious and unnatural. That men and women who have in no way earned the gratitude of the community should still be addressed by that community by titles of honour is degrading to both, but most so to those who claim such respect. It may be that many title-holders are aware of this, but they are helpless. *Palmam qui meruit ferat.* Merely to be born is no merit, and a country which retains such standards cannot be completely healthy. Think what an army would be if there were a limited race of hereditary Generals from father to son. Think again if while these hereditary Generals were at last ousted from their command they were still allowed the titles. Would that be satisfactory for the real Generals who did the work, or for the army at large? It would be disastrous. It is just so with a nation.

* * * * *

The House of Commons reminds me always of that contrivance I mentioned a while ago, called a booby trap. The idea of a House wherein the people at large are represented is admirable;

that the House when elected should make the Government, and that there should be an Opposition to criticize that Government are also admirable and, indeed, necessary. For a regenerated England we must have these things. But we have never had any of them yet. We have had only the names to hide a very different reality.

Let us consider very briefly how the House of Commons has been and is constituted. It has been and is elected and it represents those who elect it. Who are the electors of the House of Commons ?

To which the answer is simple. Each Member is representative of those who secured his election and of no one else. His election was and is secured by the Party organization and therefore he represents that organization and nothing more.

In the days before the Reform Bill a Member was given a pocket borough, or, if he stood for a larger constituency, it was in the name of one Party or the other, and the voters were bribed or bullied into voting for him. Why, therefore, owe any allegiance to the voters ? They were paid, or if not paid in cash, they gained or saved themselves from loss, such as being turned out of

their farms, for instance, by voting. The allegiance of the Member was due, then, to the Party and to the Party alone. He was returned to Parliament by Party to vote for Party.

And if some of the larger boroughs were more independent of Party that did not mean that a Member represented the people or even the borough. He was elected owing to the influence and exertion of merchants and manufacturers who made their hands vote as they were told. Thus he represented a handful of merchants and that was all.

And since the Reform and Ballot Acts are we very different ? Let us consider the actual state of affairs before the war. We had two great parties in the State, Liberal and Unionist. They each consisted of a secret Council, how composed no one exactly knew, with a huge war-chest made up of secret contributions. Who sent the contributions and why they were made were also secret, though rumour had much to say about it. How the war-chest money was spent was also kept a secret, but it was generally supposed that it was used to influence elections. Now influencing elections by means of money is supposed to be illegal. These two secret Councils had organizations throughout the country and every voter

was marked down by them and harried till he joined one or the other. There were the Liberal Federation and the Primrose League, and they had fêtes and Dames and other alluring names for things and persons.

In each constituency there was an Association of each Party, and this Association, made up of wire-pullers, kept up a register of voters. All sorts of methods were used to drive voters into these folds, the religious organizations being amongst the most influential, but tally shopkeepers and publicans of tied houses were also of no small use. Fidelity to Party was acclaimed the chief virtue of man and patriotism was almost unknown.

When an election was on the constituency was invaded by orators sent down by the Party Chiefs, who flooded the place with speeches, in which every appeal was made to prejudice or passion or personal feeling, and none whatever to reason or judgment. But everybody knows what an election is like. And finally, when the Member was elected, who did he represent? Not the constituency, because as an organized community the constituency has no existence. It has no life of its own. The Member represented the Party Chiefs in London and no one else.

And as the constituency has no real existence, so the House of Commons has not nor ever had. It is a great error to suppose that if you collect under one roof a number of men of different views the result will be some common denominator. There can only be one of two results, either they will destroy each other, or the strongest party will rule.

Thus the House of Commons has never had any real existence of its own and could never appoint or control a Government. On the contrary it is the secret cliques who appoint Government and cause the House to be elected. Neither is there any real opposition or criticism. Both secret cliques are agreed in pursuing their own private interests, and neither will so criticize the other as to damage itself. In reality Government and Opposition with us now are like two players at golf. They are opponents in a way, but they are necessary to each other. There would be no game and no stakes unless it were so. It is we who are the stakes.

The record of the House of Commons when it comes to be written will be worse than that of the House of Lords, worse in that it has pretended to stand for the people and never has.

In a regenerated England we must have a true

House of Commons, and how alone such a House can be elected I explain later. It is a very simple matter if you will look human nature in the face.

* * * * *

The legislative Union with Scotland, whereby it was sought to submerge the nationalities of England and Scotland into an impossible hybrid called Britain, to invent a mock classicism called Britannia, to make Englishmen and Scotsmen into Britons (now Britishers), and so to ignore history and tradition, fact and reason, was simply a measure of convenience. I have heard apologists for this Union declare that it prevented war in future between them. Did it ? Were Preston Pans, Dunbar and Culloden, was " the 45 " before or after the Union ? It made, or was intended to make, ruling both countries easier for the King and the ruling classes, because it is simpler to control one Parliament than two. It made it easier to ignore the idiosyncracies and desires of either nation by declaring that to fulfil them would injure the other ; or by over-voting them by alien votes ; it weakened Parliament because no Parliament now could ever stand either for England or Scotland, and it greatly weakened the sense of nationality. It injured England by

introducing Scotsmen, that is, quasi foreigners, as English politicians, and vice-versâ. It induced a great number of Scotsmen, who should have devoted their talents to their own country, to emigrate to England and infect us with foreign ideas.

On the other hand, it affected Scotland even more seriously, for besides injuring her sense of nationality it reduced her almost into the condition of a province and Edinburgh into a small provincial town. It is an irretrievable disaster to a country that its legislative centre, its administrative centre, its social, literary and artistic centres, should be in a quasi foreign country, and so should cease to be national. Scotland has been in this way drained of some of the most necessary constituents to a full and happy life, and these it cannot replace. Some form of union is necessary to manage Imperial affairs, but it should be such that in no ways brings men or ideas from one country into the domestic life of another, but leaves each to cultivate its own nationality in its own way.

England and Scotland are different countries; their people, though akin, are different in many ways, and for each to be successful it must cultivate its own national spirit in rivalry with the other. Alliance, Yes; fusion, No.

Even worse than the union of England and Scotland was that of England and Ireland, but so much has been written recently of these matters that I need add nothing. These are all evidence of that want of a true sense of patriotism which is so frequent in ruling classes or sections, and in aristocracies, for no one who truly felt what patriotism was to himself would injure it in others. He would, on the contrary, seek to cultivate it everywhere by all means in his power. And those who are blind to nationality beyond their borders are also blind to it within. They are quite ready to introduce foreign elements into their own country, to its injury and distress, as long as their own interests are thereby served.

* * * * *

The base idea of every religion, Christian or other, is that nature and humanity are evil and that life is not worth living. Religions differ only in method, and never in their fundamental conceptions. However they may try to hide it by professing that God made the world, their real certainty is that "the world, the flesh and the devil" are one; however they may profess to be animated by hope, their attitude to life here and now is one of despair. Nothing can

be made of life on earth because its very essence is evil and everyone is "conceived and born in sin."

Consequently, no religion has any ethics founded on a knowledge of life, its realities and needs, and designed to secure further and freer and happier life here. We hear a great deal about Christian ethics, but in fact they have never existed either in theory or fact. What are the ethics of the Old Testament? There is a great talk about righteousness and the righteous God, but what did right mean? Abraham made two fortunes by pretending that his wife was his sister, and selling her to kings. The God of Abraham abetted this by punishing not Abraham but the innocent kings. Is that righteousness? And throughout these chronicles it is the same. The very foundation of all right living, the realization of the essential unity and community of all men is not merely ignored but denied.

The Jews could not form a kingdom nor a civilization of any kind. They had no patriotism. Are their chronicles good examples to take on which to build up our national life?

Is the New Testament any better? There are a great many delicate and beautiful sayings;

are they a true guide to life? They touch the emotions; do they touch the intelligence? Is it good to forgive your enemies as long as they are your enemies and try to hurt you? Is it good to give a robber your cloak as well as the coat he stole, and so encourage crime? How can you have two standards, so as to render to Cæsar those things that are Cæsar's, and to God those things that are God's? You cannot divide life into water-tight compartments like this. When the early Christian was confronted with the difficulty of choosing between his duty to State and his observance of the example and precepts of his Master he threw Cæsar overboard and was a conscientious objector. The Government of a people is part of itself, an expression of its organic life, and that must be in accordance with any true system of ethics. If not, you must alter it or be its accomplice. Every virtue is only a virtue in the right place, and in the wrong place it is a vice. The Christian virtues are no exception. To be loyal and obedient to bad rulers and teachers, to be meek instead of redressing wrongs, to love where you ought to hate, to believe what is not true, are not virtues. Are your neighbours only those who are kind to you? "One touch of nature

makes the whole world kin." What does a touch of religion do ?

Is not the whole spirit of the New Testament one of despair towards this life and a hope to escape from it ? You cannot make a true morality and devise true institutions to benefit life if you despair of it. And none such have ever been made by religions.

If you turn from theory to practice things are no better. Have priests been good guides ? They finished the destruction of Roman Society which the Empire had begun. They nearly depopulated Europe in the eleventh century. They again ruined the free cities that sprung up later. They destroyed a medieval Germany. They had a great share in the ruin of Spain and she has not recovered, in the ruin of France a hundred and thirty years ago from which the Revolution restored her. They nearly strangled England till Thomas Cromwell did away with them for a while. They talk of love, but their history is one of persecution and massacre, of servility to the rich and those in power, and of hatred to the poor, thinly disguised beneath fine phrases and a demoralizing charity.

Tyrants and aristocracies have established religions because they are useful to them in

keeping the people down. When men are trying to free their country and their people, they fight religion. So did Thomas Cromwell, Napoleon when reorganizing France, Bismarck and Cavour. But when Napoleon determined to use regenerated France as a weapon to universal Empire, he became reconciled with religion, and priests chanted Te Deums for his victories; and when William II., pursuing the same idea, sent his soldiers into Belgium, they had *Gott mit uns* on their helmets.

I am continually being told that we are a Christian country. Are we a happy and united country?

Even the great organized Christian charities I hear so much praised are not things to be proud of. Charity of this nature demoralizes both those who give and those who receive. A well-organized State would need and would tolerate no charities. And it is the religious ideas of the evil of life and of the individuality of life which prevent such a State being formed not only in England but elsewhere. France thinks she has cast off religious ideas, but in fact it is not so. Her institutions and her national life are guided by them, and that she has not recognized the source from which they come, makes matters

worse. And so she has gained little, for as long as they remain nothing can be done.

And if it be said that, even ethics apart, some form of religion is necessary because it teaches of God and a future life, the answer is that neither the God nor the future life of religions is true. On the other hand, there is still in mankind and in Nature a perfectly true idea of both, only in every child it is killed by wrong teaching while the child is too weak to defend itself. When we have a true State it will rise again and grow.

* * * * *

It will have been seen in Chapter III. what the Elizabethan women were like. They were capable and intelligent, always busy, in full touch with the realities of life and, notwithstanding the marriage laws, as bad then as now for both sexes, they had, as women always have had, as much freedom as they desired, and they lived full and happy lives. They regarded their husbands' interests as their own, and they earned and obtained the respect and co-operation of men, as women always have done—when they wished to do so.

They cared, too, for their own sex, women in

power especially cared for women under their influence, they educated them and helped them.

Exactly how and when the decadence of women began it is hard to say, but we have not far to go in the Stuart reigns before we find evidence of it, and the place it began was as usual at the top. Little by little, for reasons unavowed at first but later crystallizing into a creed, women began to consider themselves as a people apart—a chosen sex, in fact. The ordinary rules which apply to all humanity that intelligence is the first quality in life, and that it can only be acquired and increased by work and contact with realities, was in future only to apply to men. Women were heaven-born. Every woman was by nature a lady, and no lady ever did any work she could possibly avoid. She was too tender and delicate for contact with "this evil world," and her virtue was so fragile that the least shock would injure it permanently. She must live a sheltered life. She was too timid to cross the street alone, and fainted at the least opportunity. She spent her time in reading sermons and novels alternately, sang a little, painted on velvet and went to church. She was not intelligent, because intelligence can only be obtained by education,

by work and experience, by looking life in the face and not being afraid of it, and by taking hard knocks, but she had no need for intelligence, for she was gifted at birth with such an extraordinary instinct that she knew everything without having to learn it. Consequently, she was always right.

Her intercourse, therefore, with men became gradually less and less. Unlike the Elizabethan woman, she was not interested in the sordid details of her father's or husband's business; the world was a closed book to her, so the subjects on which she could talk were limited. Consequently, she saw little of men because, with the best will in the world, men cannot spend more than a certain time adoring Saints on pedestals, and even the Saints no doubt soon got tired. For it must never be forgotten by women, it never is by men, that though sexuality may for a time be very strong, its effect is quickly over and the only permanent tie between a man and a woman, or men and women, is intelligence. Companionship is a question of brains, and not of appearance, nor of "goodness" nor "purity," nor anything but brains. Whatever other qualities a woman may have, if she is a fool she is soon left alone. Gradually, therefore, men

and women drifted apart until the only tie between them was the temporary sex attraction. In business or work man saw nothing of women, because women had retired from the field of work, and men in their leisure went to clubs and coffee houses and inns, where women were not allowed. Women lost all their influence over men. Fathers did not dower their daughters; when a man obtains an angel, not a helpmate, in marriage vulgar questions of money are out of place, and love, I should say LOVE, is "too pure a passion" to think about ways and means. Men avoided women and took to drinking. Even after dinner at a house they got drunk to avoid the ordeal of the drawing-room, and it became a common saying that a woman's place was in bed or with her children, and that elsewhere she was but a nuisance, and no one had any use for her.

And so, when with the advent of steam a new industrial system grew up, it developed entirely without the influence of women. In the Elizabethan era the wife of a landowner made it her care to look after and educate the girls within her influence, and the wives of the merchant and shopkeeper did the same for the women employed; they had the sense of com-

munity, but a hundred years ago all this had long passed away. The landowner's wife owed no duty to the girls on her husband's estate; the millowner's wife had none to the girls in the mill; the shopkeeper's wife knew nothing of the girls her husband employed. They were ladies, and ladies were much too "good" to be concerned with such low folk who actually worked, except maybe to give them tracts or charity. And this chosen sex idea, beginning at the top, spread down as far as it could until stopped by that great truth-bringer Necessity.

The wives and daughters of farmers refused to "lower themselves" by work or going to market to sell, and even the dairymaids ceased to be. The wives of the gentry refused to go to market to buy, they had not the knowledge how to do so, and so the markets died. Think of the loss from this alone. No woman worked who could avoid it. It was only necessity that kept the wives of even the working classes in touch with life. Woman was born to be an angel—and angels are too pure to work. Their objective is some other world—they despise and condemn this.

By the middle of the Victorian era it seemed as if English women had determined to fall to

the level of their Oriental sisters, and establish themselves in zenanas.

Then came a reaction. Women began to awake to the worthlessness of their lives, and to wish to return to the current of national life. They discovered as many have, that *Facilis est descensus Averno, sed revocare gradum.* They had for a hundred years or more abrogated their position, and men had been obliged to create an industrial world for men alone. It was not suited for women and could not readily accept women without radical changes. Moreover, men had by bitter experience discovered that women generally lacked intelligence, discipline, accuracy and perseverance owing to the pose they assumed, and their want of true education, and, therefore, strenuously and naturally opposed the entrance of women into the world of affairs. Bad as this world was, it was better than nothing, and men did not want it ruined by inexperience and ignorance.

No one has so much to gain by the intelligence of women as their relations and husbands, no one so bitterly feels the results of their ignorance, no one would more eagerly welcome their return to national life. But only on condition that they are fit for it. What is wanted in all business

matters is intelligence, experience and broad unprejudiced views of life. Angels by birth are wanting in these qualities, and women were not and are not yet willing to renounce their pretensions and to submit to the discipline of life, to cease being the "chosen sex," get rid of their fallacies, and to cultivate true ideas and their naturally great abilities in the rough school of life.

And so, feeling only the emptiness and bitterness of life, ignorant of the causes of their trouble, they turned in senseless anger on their menfolk—and we saw and see what they did and do. They blame men for what is no one's doing but their own, and what no one can retrieve but themselves. And like priests, they contend that their ignorance and scorn of the realities of life are qualities that should earn them the command and direction of all organisms of life.

When either East or West women have gone into retirement, it has been their own doing. Men have neither desired it nor, even if they did, have they the power to repress women. For women, savage and civilized, have over men far more power than men have over women, and it is only when woman demands the impossible

and absurd—and not always then—that man withstands her.

And this retirement of women has always been made under the influence and in the name of religion.

CHAPTER V

THE VILLAGE

LET us turn now to the pleasanter task of seeing how a new England can be built up, a greater, truer, sweeter country than any that the world has ever known. Having diagnosed our ills, let us see how we can so regulate ourselves as to live in future the free and abounding life of youth and health. What must we do, and how can we do it ?

At the very beginning a serious difficulty appears : To make a regenerated England we must have a Government that truly represents the country, for no other Government would have the courage and wisdom and driving force to do what must be done. But on the other hand until England is regenerated no truly representative Government seems possible, and no Party or Coalition Government could or would do anything but perpetuate the evils under which we suffer.

I have no solution of this difficulty. I can only hope that after the war a Government will arise sincerely and truly determined on National regeneration, resolved to face all the facts bravely and honestly and shrink from nothing that is necessary to the desired result. I do not know if any such Government will arise. I see no sign of it anywhere. There seem to be only two schools of thought, one that would perpetuate and even exasperate the present state of affairs, and the State Socialists.

Now State Socialism where all land, minerals, factories and machinery were State owned and State managed, where no private rights existed and where central bureaux in London managed all our affairs, seems to me a nightmare. It is a negation of every instinct and truth of humanity, it would be inefficient and corrupt beyond all calculation, it would be a tyranny beside which the tyrannies of Despots, Aristocracies and Priests would seem benevolent paternities. Such an inhumanity would only have to be started to demonstrate its falsity. It would drop us into a ruin compared with which the French Revolution would seem a summer breeze. Let us hope to be preserved from such. Let us suppose instead that some Government will

arise strong enough and determined enough to pursue a National policy of reconstruction. What would it do ?

Well, I think it would begin by laying down clearly and distinctly the ends sought, and this for two reasons.

In the first place, because not only is the personnel of Government always changing, but the methods by which ends may be achieved are often doubtful or controversial, and in the fog of discussion as to means there is a great danger of forgetting ends. They must always be kept clearly in view, or like a man in a wood, stepping aside to avoid a morass here, or cross a ravine there, all direction may be lost.

Secondly, because reconstruction must be slow. We have an organization of a sort now enough to carry on with, but it is exceedingly unstable. Too great changes made too fast might bring it into ruins about our ears. It must be remembered that it all hangs together now in a sort of way, one institution supporting the others. To reform one institution completely while the others waited would set up an incongruity that might be fatal. Change must be gradual and universal.

Meanwhile the disinherited must have patience. Show them what you mean to achieve, and that

it is good, prove to them that you really mean to do these things, enlist them on your side to help you do them, and they will have patience. Trust them that they may trust you. But if you hold out no clear and definite scheme for the future, or if they suspect your good faith, they will not have patience. And remember that though unable to build they are very potent to destroy. Moreover, they have been fed on promises till they hate them.

In a general way I have already indicated the human principles that must underlie all these institutions, and I will now take certain of the chief subjects and show more in detail how these institutions should be reformed.

The first subject is naturally the land.

The land ought to be surveyed and a record of rights established for each village. At present when rights in land are transferred lawyers have to be called in to search titles and make out deeds. There is no need for such a waste of effort and money. A record of rights once made—and it is quite a simple and cheap thing to do—titles are established. The fact of your name being on the register is final. To transfer land all the two parties need do is to buy a tracing of the survey of the land from the office, buy also a form, and

having filled it in, attend before the Registrar and sign it. Other countries have this system.

And then slowly and gradually it will be necessary to pass Acts establishing State and village rights and limit private rights.

This will be a difficult matter. It must not be forgotten that present owners of land, though in possession of rights that belong to the community, acquired those rights by laws which have been recognized for centuries. The laws are wrong, but still the fact remains. To suddenly alter all the status of land would, quite apart from the opposition it would raise, create economic disturbances that would go far to wreck the financial and business system of the country. For much money is now invested in mortgages and under the new tenure no mortgage would be legal. Mortgages are by the experience of all periods and all countries most injurious to the land. The money is not usually raised to improve the land, but for other purposes, so that the land bears a burden that should not be laid upon it. Mortgaged estates are starved estates. Moreover, by mortgages power over land is given to outsiders which must not be allowed. With village banks ample money for improvements in agriculture and buildings will always be obtainable without

mortgage. In fact, it is a principle of those banks never to take a mortgage. Thus time would have to be given to mortgagees to get out.

Further, although theoretically it must be affirmed that both the State and the community has a right to all land it requires on payment of compensation only, it is doubtful whether it would be feasible to enforce this right to the full until after the lapse of a long period that would enable people to adjust themselves to what would come. If suddenly enforced many people who have bought land in perfectly good faith might be ruined. Fancy prices could immediately be stopped and a steadily diminishing scale could be adopted.

The same caution would have to govern the application of the rule that no one should own more land than he occupies himself. To spring such a law upon the country would result in large quantities of land being thrown on the market for which there would be no purchasers, and land values would fall to zero with economic disaster. This, too, would have to come slowly to give time for the new race of yeomen to grow up and for village banks to be prosperous.

But whatever caution was observed in method,

it would have to be made quite clear and certain that these reforms were to come, and in not too far a future. No new England can be built up unless and until they are fully arrived.

And meanwhile the village communities could be gradually formed and endowed with power. In rural England the present Parish, District and County Councils could probably provide the nucleus required. In the towns it would be necessary to institute Ward Councils. And these Parish or Ward Councils would have eventually to be given a great deal of power. They would have to see that the land laws were enforced, that village rights were respected and, where taken away, were restored. With *them* would lie the regulation of traffic within their boundaries, the provision of footpaths and recreation grounds, the prevention of overbuilding, the due improvement of the streets and buildings, the regulation of the inns and the establishment of village banks. They would, of course, be subject to the Government and the County Councils, but such interference should only extend to matters affecting the State or County, not to village affairs. Such Councils, if truly formed, are never dominated by any one interest and are never corrupt. Both these defects arise in organizations that are not

true organisms and never in true and natural organisms. All experience proves that it is so. They would, of course, make mistakes, but wisdom can only be learned by so doing. Interference destroys the organism, as it has in India and as it is doing in Burma.

The hardest task would be before the Ward Councils of great towns. It would be for them to open out the streets and make the place anew with recreation grounds and parks and walks, instead of bricks and mortar. It would involve a slow displacement of population, but that must be done. Employers could not object because all employers would have to live in the same Parish with their works, and so their interests would coincide with those of the workers. They could not live in a pleasant West End, or in the country, while their factories poisoned the air and their workmen lived in slums. The Captains of Industry would be like the Captains of Companies and live with their men. Think of the increased efficiency that would result. It is incalculable. Moreover, the wealth made in a locality would be taxable by that locality. Nowadays it is taken elsewhere. What a revolution of values there would be. It is the East Ends that would be rich and the West Ends poor,

because the former are productive and the latter are not.

There would also, I think, have to be certain exceptions to this rule giving over control to the Village Councils. You could not give control of Westminster, for instance, to any Council of inhabitants. It would have to be under the State alone. State dockyards would have to be State. And there are cases of big industries, such as shipbuilding yards and others, where some special treatment would seem to be required. Success does not lie in following a mechanical plan, but in preserving ideas and altering methods of realizing those ideas according to circumstances. The idea that masters and men must live together, that everyone is entitled to recreation grounds, pleasant walks, fresh air and proper dwellings, must be secured everywhere. The idea that every man is the member of a community and has a right to communal institutions and communal help must also be preserved. Methods to secure these ideas may vary.

The Council would also have much control over the schools and the present standardization of education should cease. The requirements of different localities in the way of education, especially secondary and technical education, are

different, and each Village or Ward Council should have wide powers. An emulation would also be set up and it would be the pride of each Council to have a better school and more intelligent scholars than any other. Children of all classes should attend the same primary schools, and so learn to know each other. Specialist education should begin much later. No boy or girl should be allowed to enter on life unskilled. Every member of a village community is a potential gain or loss to that community. He must be made a gain.

And finally there should be village banks. One of the greatest hindrances to all local enterprise now is the want of money. Land cannot be highly cultivated, decent houses cannot be built, improvements cannot be made, local shops and local traders are heavily handicapped, because there is no money available. The land, therefore, does not yield a tithe of what it should, and local tradesmen are ruined by the competition of great Stores with numerous branches. These Stores are not really good—no monopolies or approaches to monopolies are either efficient or useful—and the things they supply are not so satisfactory as what a local man could furnish if he had working capital. But whereas the big man can borrow in

London all he wants, or float a Joint Stock Company and raise money on debentures, the little man can get nothing.

Now this is not because there is no money in the village. There is always some, frequently a great deal, sometimes far more than is wanted, but it is not available, and the reasons are as follows :

In the Elizabethan times, as I have said, money remained in the village. Fifty years ago and before there were local banks which would advance money on loan and overdraft to farmers and others, but these local banks from a variety of causes have either failed or been amalgamated with the great London Joint Stock Banks and the latter do not care to advance. They have not the local knowledge, for whereas the partners in the old country banks mixed with all society and knew everyone and could tell how much to advance, the manager of the branch has no such knowledge. Further, the country bank was interested in the prosperity of the neighbourhood, the London bank cares nothing for it, and finally, the country bank having no London headquarters had to use its deposits locally, whereas the London banks take them to London and use them in international finance.

The country is thus bled white of lendable money. The Joint Stock Banks receive deposits, the Post Office takes savings, Companies issue shares, and all the money is taken away to London. It is all take and no give, and unless a farmer or shopkeeper go to a moneylender and borrow at 30 per cent. he has to do without loans. Thus while London finances most foreign countries England is starved and cannot progress.

The object then of village banks is twofold: first, to supply money on short loans to farmers, shopkeepers, artisans, or others who require it and so greatly increase the prosperity of the community; and secondly, to enable those of the community who are lenders rather than borrowers to keep their money in their community instead of sending it to London and so get better interest for it than either the Post Office or the Joint Stock Banks can give. The method, too, is quite simple, and though it is not necessary here to enter into details—they can be found in Mr. Wolf's books and in many articles in the *Contemporary Review* and elsewhere—it will be convenient to give a general outline.

First of all, a short Act of Parliament is required defining the status of these banks, their liabilities, and the reserves they must keep.

Secondly, though not absolutely necessary, a Government auditor is, at any rate at first, of great assistance.

Thirdly, in order to start the first banks and demonstrate how they work in practice, a small sum of money, say, £20,000 or so, at low interest is required. When the banks are started and in running order, this is repaid and no more such money is required. The Government has one hundred and eighty millions of village money. It should return some of it.

(1) The bank consists of an unlimited number of members, all within the village boundary and all elected as to a club ; eventually every villager ought to belong.

(2) Members may deposit money on interest or borrow money, but no one except a member may do either.

(3) The bank is managed by an elected committee.

(4) All the members of the bank are liable for its debts.

(5) Its funds are derived

(a) from deposits by members.

(b) from money borrowed by the bank as a whole from outside.

(6) Certain registers are kept and there is an audit every six months.

(7) The clerk, of course, must be paid, but as two or three hours' work a week is as much as most small banks need, this comes to little, and the committee act gratuitously.

(8) The ordinary security which bankers demand, such as mortgages, etc., is not needed. Money is usually lent, at any rate at first until the bank is rich, on personal security and for periods not exceeding a year.

It will be seen that the foundation idea of these banks is that of community, of the necessity of each to all and all to each, that those who have money should keep it in their own village and the credit of all should be used for the benefit of individuals. The idea is simple and true, and the success of these banks has been enormous. Even the Balkan States have them, and in one form or another they are almost universal in Europe, and in India they are rapidly spreading. The ease of working is obvious. There are no securities to be checked, no documents to be drawn out, no valuation to be made. The committee lends only to its own

members, who are personally known. It knows their circumstances, their reputation, their need or otherwise, and when the loan is made, it knows if the borrower is using the money as he ought. Even if a borrower wished to be dishonest, he could not be, for in a village all is known. Moreover, sentiment plays a great part; one might defraud or let in an anonymous bank, but few men would let in their neighbours. Now the village bank is your neighbour. Losses except through some unforeseen disaster are unknown.

Thus the farmer and small cultivator can borrow money to buy stock, or machinery, or manure, or for buildings; the village shopkeeper can double his business, the artisan can buy tools or materials. And the man who has savings can see them fructify in his own village, thus again indirectly benefiting himself, and he gets more interest than in the savings bank.

Moreover, although when newly-introduced into a country they take some time to take root, indeed, the first trial banks are very difficult to start and work, once a few banks are established and the system can be seen in operation, they rapidly spread and they soon are in possession of large funds. It was in 1863 that the first experimental bank was started by

Raffeison, with £300 capital. The latest returns I saw before the war of these banks in Germany, gave their united funds as £1,500,000,000. I have been unable to verify this figure and I think it may be exaggerated, but no doubt the sum was very large. In India these banks were started by Government in 1904, and for several years had a hard struggle of it against caste prejudice, ignorance and poverty, but in eleven years their capital had come to over £5,000,000.

Such a bank should exist in every village with a central bank at county headquarters for the purpose of receiving the surplus from banks with more than they need and lending it to minus banks. There would be a clearance bank in London.

A village community would thus be a complete unit in itself, having control over its land, its money, its health and sanitation, its inns and amusements, its education, giving to each and all of these things that minute and personal interest and knowledge which alone secures success. Probably later it would add to these other institutions. It would become a healthy and active community and full of patriotism. Only by such communities can nations be reorganized.

Remember that the base is the land. It is contiguity that makes a community, because it makes the interest of each the interest of all, and because it creates mutual knowledge and respect. It is the freedom of the land that makes the freedom of the community. A big landlord would hold the community at his mercy. Even suppose big landlords abolished, if private ownership were absolute as it is now no community could thrive. It would be blackmailed for every improvement.

Notice, too, that whereas our present institutions, landownership, education, health, finance, those institutions which have failed, have been purely individual, these new institutions are communal. That does not mean that the individual is ignored. It is pure individualism that kills the individual because it renders him helpless. Central Governments standardize him. Man naturally collects into communities for mutual assistance, for combined effort, for social intercourse, and only by and through such communities can he attain his full individual freedom. The principle of community does not do away with the struggle of existence; it intensifies it, but it arms all more or less equally, so that all win and there are no losers. The struggle

becomes, therefore, a stimulant and injures no one. The principle of community is the first truth.

Think of what an English village would be like materially when reconstructed under these principles. All the land would be cultivated to the utmost, because every cultivator, big or small, and every householder would, subject to very unlikely State or village needs and subject to proper use, have his land and house as his own. He would grudge nothing of labour to improve it. He would have command of ample funds. He would have a market for his dairy and other produce, with no middlemen's profits to meet. The village co-operative society would get him manure at wholesale rates, would collect surplus eggs, fruit and vegetables, and send them to the big towns.

The village shopkeeper would have ample command of money to enable him to keep good stocks and he would have far richer customers.

There would be village bakehouses, baths, and crèches. The whole material standard of life would be raised to an incredible degree.

Spiritual progress grows hand in hand with material progress. You cannot divorce them. The idea common to all religions that a man can

have a high spiritual standard with a low material standard is not true. They praise poverty. To them hermits who lived in caves, clothed in rags and covered with dirt, ignorant and fanatic, may be great examples; they are not mine. Everyone must have a decent house, sufficient earnings and a good education. He must be in continual touch with all classes in order to retain and augment his humanity. In these village communities the community itself would for its own sake ensure all these things. It would have the will to do so, it would have the knowledge and it would have the power. No present institution has even one of these three qualifications.

CHAPTER VI

THE WINE OF LIFE

THERE is one other village institution that must be dealt with before going to more general matters, and it must be dealt with at some length because it is of the greatest importance—that is, the village inn. For it was the centre of village social life and that social life must be restored.

I have already shown how gay the Elizabethan was and how this gaiety is a necessary factor of healthy life. It has been steadily decreasing in England ever since then, but it is only in the last fifty or sixty years it has been extinguished. It is of the first necessity that it be restored and augmented, and it is easy to show how this can be done. But before explaining the causes of the decline and the means of restoration, it will be convenient to give some conversations I have had recently with different people on the

subject, because they illustrate a good many things.

The first was with an old farmer in the village of Sleepy Hollow.

Going up one morning towards the moor, I stopped for a while to rest upon a tree stump that found itself conveniently by the wayside, and presently along the same road came a farmer. He was an old man, but hale and hearty yet, over six feet I should judge, and when he saw me there he stopped.

"When I was young, sir," he said with a laugh, "I'd walk all day and never stop, but I'm eighty now and I'll do as you do." Then he sat down beside me and he lit his pipe.

"It's a long time to look back," I said.

"Aye," and he nodded, "but it's pleasant to look back. Those was pleasanter days than now—a sight pleasanter. Life was more rough like then, but folk were more"—he hesitated for a word—"more human like."

"As how?" I asked.

He reflected, pulling at his pipe. "When I was a lad," he said, "my father used to go four nights a week to the 'Dragon.' He had his own chair and his own pipe, and his friends had their chairs and their pipes, and they drank their

two pots of beer, and they heard all the news and talked about village things and business. They were very pleasant among themselves and sometimes strangers joined them and were made welcome. The squire, too, he'd look in sometimes, and the doctor, though mostly they'd meet with other gentry twice a week in the parlour. In the taproom there was another sort of club and in the other public houses there was others. Few men but had some place to go—not to drink, mind you, though of course they'd have their pint or two, but to meet friends and be pleasant. And before that, and before *that*, so I've heard my father say, it was the same or more so."

"And now?" I asked.

"'Tis gone," he answered. "The bar's a place to go for a drink and that's all. It don't seem to be considered a proper place," and he laughed. "'Tis take your drink and go. 'Tain't your company what's wanted, 'tis your money. Pay it and go."

I nodded, and the old man fell into retrospect.

"Each man had his song in my father's day," he continued, "and they used to have sing-songs, and singing matches and fiddle playing still,

same as in the older days. People was gayer like then. Now there isn't no place to go o' evenings. There isn't no fellowship now. We all just lives alone. What's happened to the country, sir ? "

" Has anything happened ? " I asked.

" Aye, it has," he said emphatically. " Sommat bad, kind o' blight like. I don't deny that in some ways things is better. Roads are better and tea and such like is cheap, and the labourers are better off. But Lord, how sad they all are ! D'ye ever hear the ploughman whistling or the maid singing now ? "

I shook my head.

" In my father's time they did. I did. My wife, who's dead years ago, was a fine singer and dancer, but my daughter don't know any of such things. There used to be a fair, I remember, three days it lasted, and the lads treated the maids, and kissed them on the sly, too. There's no fair now and no kissing mostly. 'Tis sinful, I'm told. There used to be lots of dancing on the green o' summer nights and in barns o' winter. Folks was friendly and jolly. What's come to 'em, sir ? What are they afraid of ? "

" What do you think ? " I asked.

He seemed about to say something and stopped,

glanced at me and said, "D'ye know what the young folks say now?"

"What do they say?" I asked.

"They says, my grand-daughter says to me the other day when I asked for a merry catch, 'This is a weary world, Grand-dad; 'tis to be borne with and suffered,' and she shows the whites of her eyes. That's what they're like nowadays. A weary world," and he got up indignantly. "Aye, 'tis so maybe for those who make it so. 'Tain't so for me even though I have rheumatics," and he rubbed his back ruefully. "D'ye think, sir, the world will ever be brave and wise and merry again?"

I said it could if it chose, and then he went on his way.

* * * * *

The second was with a retired butler, who is an excellent fellow and has a charming cottage in Sleepy Hollow, not far from the "Dragon." I met him one evening standing at his garden gate, apparently doubtful whether he would come out or not. He had lifted the latch but had then stopped with the gate wide open and reflected.

"Are you coming my way?" I asked.

"Well, sir," he answered, "I did think of going to the 'Dragon' for a glass of beer."

"Why not?" I asked.

He shook his head. "I want the beer and a change from the house would do me good; but it's uncomfortable in the 'Dragon.' There's only the tap-room and it's full of labourers and such like. I'm not complaining of them, they are good lads and have just as much right there as me, but we don't make company together, sir. Their talk is about things I don't know, their own affairs. And the room's small, when they are talking no one else can talk. I have my friends, too, and we'd like a corner or a room where we could sit and talk to ourselves of an evening. But there is no place."

"And visiting each other at home isn't the same?"

"No, sir. There's my wife, she wouldn't care for men to come and sit in her parlour and drink beer and talk and she left out, and other men's wives are the same. Besides, you aren't free in another man's house like in an inn. We can't afford a club."

"And so you have to go without?"

"And so I'm going without. Good night, sir," and he went in.

* * * * *

The third was with my waitress in a restaurant, not at Sleepy Hollow, but at the pleasure city of Idlecombe. I had lunched there several times and she knew me quite well. She had been in training for a nurse, but broke down in health and so came here as a waitress, hoping to regain her strength. She seemed a good deal upset about something and had, I think, been crying. When an opportunity came I asked her if anything had gone wrong, and after a moment's hesitation she told me all about it.

It was her brother, a lad some two years younger than she, who was a skilled mechanic in some motor works now doing munition work. He had been ill with influenza and did not make a quick recovery, so was sent away to the sea and came to his sister at Idlecombe. His health was improving, it was not that she was troubled about, it was another matter.

"He is taking to drinking too much," she said. "He does it because there is nothing else to do all day and in the evenings, too. He has no friends here and nowhere to go but the bars. He has made one or two acquaintances there and because they mayn't stay long in one bar they go to another, and because you can't go into a bar unless you take a drink they have to take drinks.

He doesn't get drunk, but he is learning to like drink. I wanted him to go to the Y.M.C.A.'s place, but 'I'm not a pauper,' he answers. 'I'm not a Sunday school boy nor a Charity boy. I don't want anyone's patronage. I want friends and a place to meet my friends free and independent, where we can play a game and be jolly. I would also like to meet girls, but there's no place but the streets.' There is no place but the streets," she repeated, "for any of us."

* * * * *

My fourth conversation was with a village girl of twenty-two, a pretty girl and by nature a merry girl, and what she told me many others have also told me. I asked her if she ever sang.

"Sing, sir? No, I can't sing. At Sunday School they sang hymns, but I couldn't learn. They are so sad like. I've heard music-hall songs sometimes at a concert here, but I can't sing them. I wasn't taught. No one isn't taught, except maybe the choir boys to sing psalms. I don't know that I care for music. Nor I can't dance. Nobody dances now. There's no place and no music. No, I haven't any amusement, except sometimes when the 'pictures'

come. I go to see them because it's some place to go and something to do. Where do I walk with my young man ? In summer if it's fine we can get down by the river, other times there's only the streets. I take him to tea to mother's, or we go to his mother's place. It's all there is. There aren't no fairs now, either. There's sometimes a fête at the Squire's with a band and things. It's for the voters and their families. If your father don't vote that way you can't go. I'm going to London if I can. The country is only a place to die in, not to live in."

But, poor child, will she find the town any better ? Unless she go "on the streets" where will she find amusements or society anywhere now ?

* * * * *

My fifth conversation was with a lady who is an old friend of mine, which is not to suggest that she is old, but only that we have known each other a good many years. It occurred on another part of the coast, where in the last twenty years houses and villas have grown up like mushrooms, and she was telling me that when she was a young girl and lived here it was all pine woods.

"It was much pleasanter in those days," she

said. "Of course, I was young, which makes a difference, but it really was jolly, and even now pleasant memories come up. Only a few years ago when I was here on a visit I seemed to recognize the man who drove me, and when I got out I told him 'I seem to remember your face. I lived here as a girl; perhaps it was then?' The man looked at me very hard and then of a sudden his face lightened and he said 'Yes, I thought I recognized your face, too. Surely you are Miss C——, and used to dance with us in the evening in the woods.' Then he told me his name and I remembered him quite well."

"Those were pleasant times," she continued, "and those dances were very jolly. We had music, a violin and I forget what, and young folk of all classes came down, the girls with their mothers or some one, and we all danced together. It did us all so much good. We were furious when the dances were stopped."

"Ah!" I said. "They *were* stopped?"

"Yes," she admitted.

"And by . . . . ?"

"Yes," still more reluctantly, "it *was* the Vicar who stopped them."

* * * * *

The causes of the complete suppression of all amusement and gaiety in England are several. They can all be traced back to one first cause, the destruction of the community, but it will be convenient to take them one by one. The first is the deterioration of the ale.

As I have already said, "The good liquor that our honest forefathers did use to drink of, which preserved their health and made them live so long and do so many good deeds" was English ale. It was of varying degrees of strength, but was mainly light ale, it was newly brewed and it had no hops. It approximated, therefore, to the present light ales of the Continent, of which you can drink a good deal without any feeling but a pleasant stimulation, and which even if you can manage to drink too much produces no brutalizing intoxication, but only a sleepiness. It was, take it all round, the most wholesome drink in the world. This, as I have already said, with wine and such drinks as mead were the only liquors obtainable. Spirits were not introduced from Holland till the seventeenth century, and for many years encountered great opposition. Heavy beer brewed with hops was introduced from the same country earlier, but for long it could gain no foothold. The taste was disliked,

the stupefying effect of the hops* and the increased strength was felt and disapproved, and English ale held its own for long. The reasons why English ale was eventually ousted by this foreign introduction seem to have been as follows: The real English home-brewed did not keep well. "Hot weather and thunder and want of company are the hostesse's griefs, for then her ale sours. Your drink usually is very young, two days old." With the increasing dislike of women to do any work they could avoid, this trouble was greatly felt, and the brewing of beer fell more and more into the hands of big brewers, especially those of Burton.

Another cause that drove the business of brewing into the hands of the capitalists was the institution of the excise on beer and the increasing restrictions which it caused. There was no excise in Elizabeth's day and its impositions increased but slowly.

Thus local brewing ceased and the big brewers got the monopoly. Having got the monopoly they ceased to brew sweet ale because it did not keep well and substituted heavily hopped beer

* The hop is a member of the hemp family of plants. Indian hemp or *bhang* is so dangerous a brain narcotic that even to grow it in your garden is a penal offence.

for it, and they forced their productions everywhere by means of tied houses.

Thus the local publican whose interests were identical with those of his village, and consequently opposed to drugged drinks and to intoxication, was superseded by a nominee of strangers whose only idea was to make profit. The idea behind the inn had changed.

And the idea behind the customers changed in consequence. They used to go to the inn for good fellowship. It was now unobtainable, and to replace it they drank too much. The hopped beers suited the new idea, because intoxication was produced more quickly and was more heavy.

Further, a habit of intoxication was set by the aristocracy. When it was not improper for Ministers of the Crown to go to the House drunk, when gentlemen habitually got drunk after dinner, and when "drunk as a lord" was a description from life, the poor could hardly be expected to be sober. For these and other reasons as well, drinking increased and became coarser, grosser and more demoralizing. The inn became a curse and not a blessing.

Then came the Puritan and the Reformer, and it cannot be denied that he had reason. But he misused it. He should have studied the

causes of drunkenness and got them removed, but he did not do that. He went to the other extreme, he denounced all alcohol as evil, all amusement as dangerous, all sociability as leading to "sin," and he waged war upon all of them. His object was and is to make England as sad, as joyless, as wanting in humanity as himself, and he used his influence with the Government to this end. Everything that made the public-house attractive was to be done away with; music and games and pleasant seats and so on were all prohibited, and the inns have been degraded into bars.

So between the brewer and the Puritan matters have come to their present pass, the village community is dead, the people are helpless and the Government, knowing and caring nothing for the people, is swayed either by brewer or Puritan, according to which Party is in power.

I wonder what Falstaff would say could he revisit us. If he were again to ask his famous question, "Shall I not take mine ease in my inn?" the answer would not be doubtful. The brewer would reply that inns are to drink in and not to take your ease in, and the Puritans would say simply that inns ought to be destroyed.

With the ruin of the inn has come also the

suppression of all that was connected with it, the music, the singing, the dancing, the good fellowship. In Sleepy Hollow there are only four places open to the public where music is allowed, the Church and three Chapels. No competition is permitted, the Justices take care of that. Can you wonder that the natural taste for music has died out? Would a ploughman care to whistle "A few more years shall roll" as he led his team abroad in the twilight mystery of the morn, or the maid carol "Day of Wrath! O day of mourning!" as she did her housework or her sewing? When are they ever taught any of that real music or real poetry that makes you strong and brave and glad? ready to thank God that you were born? Where are the modern equivalents of the madrigals and part-songs of Elizabethan times?

> "It was a lover and his lass,
> With a heigh and a ho and a heigh nonnino."

Lovers are improper persons to-day, and "gin a body kiss a body comin' through the rye" both "bodies" are likely to hear so much more about it from the unco' guid who have spies everywhere, that they will wish they never had been born into a world in which every good thing is denounced.

Let us consider, then, what is to be done, and first let us consider human needs, for unless we clearly understand them we are likely to go wrong.

After work is done a man—and a woman, too—requires relaxation and change; he wants to use those parts which work has left unused, he needs to regain his balance, he wants a stimulant and wants to forget work for a while. Now the best stimulant is talk and amusement and gaiety with his friends and with women, and if he gets this he will drink but comparatively little "alcohol," just enough to enable him to throw off the fatigue of work and exercise his mind, because he gets the stimulation in another way. But if he have no amusement he will drink more alcohol, because the need for stimulation and temporary forgetfulness still remains.

And this need has another source than only relaxation. Work divides men into classes, play dissolves these classes and makes us meet on a footing of equality. It reminds us that though discipline in work is necessary it does not imply that one individual is less valuable to the community than any other. In play discipline gives place to comradeship, to humanity, to mutual understanding, it revises values and it tends to a sense of unity.

Play, too, unites the sexes which while at work are usually divided, and there is nothing more necessary to both sexes than contact with its complement. Men who know only men know only half life, and are only half developed, and the same is true of women. They are very necessary to each other, even from childhood, and only play brings them together.

Now play is only possible to communities, and is not possible to a mere collection of individuals. With strangers and those we never meet except for pleasure, we are not on the same terms as with those we know outside the place of amusement. Neither you nor I care to amuse ourselves before strangers or with strangers; why should you suppose other people are different because they may be poorer?

It is this fact which—far more than material difficulties—stood in the way of success with Sir Walter Besant's People's Palace, and will prevent the success of any such schemes. You cannot gather together a number of people and, providing them with space and music and implements, make them happy. You might as well tell a lot of children strange to each other to "play." When life both in rural and town areas is again organized, these organisms will soon

arrange for their own amusements, but until then it is quite impossible. The organisms do not exist, and without them no outside power can do anything.

Meanwhile, those ways of passing time in towns which are called amusements, though no doubt they are better than nothing, in no way take the place of the games which an organized community arranges for itself. To sit watching a cricket match or a football match is mere passivity. It is not that activity of parts of the human body and brain unused in work which is so necessary for all of us. It has not even the advantage of encouraging esprit de corps, for football players are bought gladiators. Cricket teams are not so bad, but cricket takes too long to ever be a popular game in the sense football is. The "Pictures," even if they represented truer ideas than they do now, come under the same category. They are so popular only "because there is nowhere else to go and nothing to do." They, with theatres, music halls and all spectacles, are good things in their time and place, but they do not in the least fulfil that human need for social intercourse on the pleasant terms of mutual amusement which only an organism can arrange for itself. Nor will any

entertainments given by others take the place of those meetings where the members entertain each other. The re-establishment of the community is the absolute first essential to the resuscitation of gaiety and happiness. But the re-establishment of communities will take a long time. Nevertheless, pending their complete re-establishment and assumption of the control of their own affairs, including the control of the inn, a great deal might be done. These are some of them.

No one resident outside a village area, and no stranger, should be allowed to own a public house or inn or receive a licence. No one who is not independent should receive a licence. Nominees and salaried managers should be abolished. The taste for the drugged bitter beers would be discouraged, and the far more natural taste for sweet ale allowed to revive.

The establishment of village clubs or societies, like in the old days, who can hire a room in the inn two or three times a week for their meetings, should be encouraged. There could be men's clubs of various grades and mixed clubs. The latter should be encouraged to have music and dancing, and other games, no one but a member being admitted.

The bars ought to be made more like cafés, and if necessary, an entrance fee could be charged to make up for the much smaller consumption of liquor which would ensue.

But given an innkeeper who is a permanent resident, who has capital and who is subject only to reasonable restrictions, and these things will right themselves. He will for his own sake make his house attractive, and the village will help him. In the country villages I do not see much difficulty, and I think that in a comparatively short time the inn might again be on the high road to prosperity.

In the towns the matter is more difficult. One thing that must never be done is to allow dancing-saloons open to all comers; another is to have any taint of patronage or charity.

The true safeguard is the sense of community. No man and no woman will behave badly in the company of those he associates with habitually. He is bound to them by too many ties to risk being turned out. He will also willingly obey rules formed by his club committee, that is his *alter ego*, while he hates and tries to evade legal restrictions as intolerable. The solution, therefore, in towns—until the communities are fully reconstituted—is the encouragement of the for-

mation of clubs or societies amongst, say, employees of one firm; guilds of workmen or apprentices, or other groups of people who are connected together by work or locality, and giving them full facilities for meetings. And if the Puritan interfere, follow the famous example of the Elizabethans, and put him in the stocks revived for this purpose. Don't listen to him. His real object is not to purify amusements, but to destroy them. He is your greatest enemy.

There will be occasional lapses; that is no reason for prohibiting the amusement. All forms of amusement have their dangers. Footballers break limbs or are even killed, so are boxers; swimmers and fishermen are drowned, climbers fall from Alps, riders are thrown, even pedestrians sprain their ankles and get run over. No man in his senses, however, wishes to prohibit these things. Take all reasonable precautions and when the inevitable accident arises, make as little of it as possible. Don't brand the unfortunate as "a dreadful example of what happens in these cases;" bandage up his wounds and say nothing more about it. Remember always that lapses, like crimes, are far more the fault of the community than of the individual who falls; don't, therefore, visit all the blame

on him, for much of it is yours. Such lapses will grow less and less as our institutions improve.

So shall we have Merrie England back again, and Merrie England will be efficient England, too.

CHAPTER VII

LOVE

BUT in order that the relationship of the sexes in play be satisfactory, it is necessary that they be so at work also, economically, sexually and socially. If a new and true England is to be rebuilt, it must not be a man's world nor a woman's world, but a world of men and women, living together harmoniously and happily, taking each their share of all work and play there is to be done, and to accomplish this, the laws and conventions of sex must be framed on a true knowledge of the sex emotion. This emotion has been the most powerful agent in the hands of the Designer of Nature in accomplishing the work of evolution, it is through it that all individual life organisms exist, and in the construction of the greater organisms of the community it must have a powerful influence. There is no emotion so strong as the sex emotion at certain periods of

life in men, and sometimes even in women; it is capable of over-riding even the emotion of self-preservation, and if you determine to condemn it and fight it instead of studying it and assisting it, you cannot make a success.

Let us, therefore, consider the emotion somewhat in detail.

In the first place love is a physical emotion and nothing else. The idea that there are two loves, physical and spiritual, profane and sacred, and that both are emotions, is nonsense. There is only one emotion of love—which is simply a form of attraction—though, of course, it has somewhat different manifestations according to its object—wife, son, father and so on—and it is purely physical. That which is supposed to be spiritual or sacred love is not an emotion at all; it is a quality of the intelligence, and its best name is comprehension or understanding. There is sometimes a connection between the two, inasmuch as understanding may awaken love. The more you comprehend Nature and what is natural in humanity and in men and women, the more you admire it and love it, because your emotion is so constituted that it is awakened by and reacts to true things.

On the other hand, the more you comprehend

false and artificial things, the more you hate them. If Madame de Staël when she said *tout savoir c'est tout aimer* meant by "*tout*" all natural things, she was right; but if she meant all things, true or false, then she was mistaken. The intelligence studies and the emotions tell it how to distinguish the true from the false by instinctively loving or hating what the intelligence clearly presents to it. Just so does the palate tell you what of the things you place on it are good for food.

Comprehension itself is a matter of the intelligence, which is not itself capable of emotion, but uses the emotions as its servants.

Love, therefore, is purely a physical emotion, exactly as hate, or fear, or hunger. Its mode of reaction depends upon the object, whether parent, or child, or mate, but it is always the same emotion, and if you are not capable of feeling it strongly in one direction, neither can you in any other.

The simplest form of it is sex emotion, which besides being an emotion is a function, and if you will consider the matter carefully, you will see that this is the parent emotion of all the others above mentioned as well as of love of nature, art and literature.

It is, in fact, the parent emotion of all the emotions, and as it varies, so do they. The intimate relationship between sex emotion and courage has been frequently remarked upon. Suppress one and you suppress the other. And this is equally true of the other emotions.

To suppress the sex emotion is like damping down the fire in a steam engine; you can get no steam for any purpose. Further, as it is through the emotions that we acquire knowledge of other people, by feeling ourselves what they feel, by *sympathy*, the suppression of emotion leads to want of understanding of humanity. Thus arises that inhumanity of the intellect so frequently seen in those who unduly suppress this emotion, because no matter how great the intellect, it argues from false data. They have no sympathy and so cannot understand.

Physically and mentally, both men and women, in order to be sound and well balanced, are dependent on the free and reasonable exercise of this bodily function. To suppress it upsets the whole nervous system, leads to dreams and hallucinations, to hysteria and want of balance and humanity, while excess leads to weakness, physical and mental, to anæmia and other ills. It is independent of our will, we cannot arouse

it towards any object we choose, nor can we stifle it if awakened towards an object our intelligence disapproves. All we can do at best is to prevent its manifestation.

It has a selective quality of its own which we daily observe in action. A loves B and is indifferent to C, and this selective attraction is not always nor, indeed generally, to be attributed to personal appearances, because we do not agree always about such matters. The cause is deeper. In fact, as the universal experience of mankind shows, that mutual attraction between a man and a woman which is love, is Nature's indication that they are suited to be the parents of such children as Nature wants. Thus, because Nature dislikes too great a deviation from the normal, those who are super-normal in one respect, fall in love with those infra-normal in that same way. The tall falls in love with the short, the red-haired with the dark-haired, the rash with the cautious, the genius with the fool. On the other hand, mediocrities mate together, and there is often even a likeness between man and wife as if they came from the same stock originally. Further, that this emotion is generally far stronger in men than in women and lasts longer. In Nature's opinion, a woman is not

suitable for maternity except during at most thirty years of life, but men are potential fathers during a much greater period. And although the potential is not always the actual, yet usually the need of man for the exercise of the emotion is stronger and longer than with women.

The idea underlying the design of the Maker of Nature in making men and women, seems to be as follows :

Men are to do all the heavy work, both physical and mental, and are constructed to that end. Great mental and muscular capacity means great emotional capacity, and sex emotion being the base emotion they must be strongly sexual. It follows from this greater sexuality that they are the poets and artists, and that woman is their principal theme. And woman furnishes the audience, delighted to hear her own praises sung.

Woman's primary use being the all-important one of bearing and bringing up children, Nature has admirably adapted her to this function, not, however, forgetting to adapt her just as admirably to the other functions she alone can fulfil.

She is not muscular, nor strongly emotional, nor is her brain a replica of man's brain, but diverse, and the reasons of these things are very obvious.

Were she equally muscular with men, she would be as fitted to rough work and to fighting as men, and in these matters compete with men instead of completing men. She would be a rival, not a mate, and injure her primary function. She is not so emotional, for were she equally emotional, she would seek man sexually as much as he seeks her, and so her present advantage would be lost.

Her brain does not compete with man's brain, but complements it, supplying those very qualities in which he is defective. Thus he sees far and a woman near ; a man generalizes and so misses details, a woman sees and recognizes details ; a man is impersonal, a woman is personal.

Generally speaking, a woman comes into a man's life. He is earning a livelihood or making a career and she joins him ; he does not join her in any career she may have had. Usually in the richer classes she has had none, and in any case she abandons it with delight. For woman generally, though as willing to work as man, does not like the same conditions. She wants to be " on her own." She dislikes fixed hours, discipline, rigid rules and association with others.

One of the reasons, for instance, that man

cannot make a home is his dislike to details that seem to him petty, but no details are petty to a woman.

Thus they can never compete. In the open market women, a few exceptions apart, are worth little either for muscular work or brain work, and although they can earn a living alone, it is a poor one. The primary impulse driving a woman to marriage is want of money. Man, on the other hand, is absolutely dependent on women for sexual relief first, and then for making a home, for rearing his children and for that further economic assistance I speak of presently.

Were men and women not so made the world would have come to an end long ago. This is obvious directly you consider it. For suppose men as little emotional as most women before marriage few would ever marry. They can generally see clearly the drawbacks of having to share their life, their income and giving up their liberty, and it is only the strong sexual desire that overcomes this aversion. On the other hand, could women attain economic success alone few would ever marry. The sexual attraction is small, and the desire for parenthood so strong in nearly all men, even in young manhood, is not awakened in a woman till she is a mother. On

the contrary most girls fear and dislike the idea of maternity.

Thus it is sex necessity that drives a man to marriage, and economic necessity that drives a woman. These are the primary causes of marriage. I do not say the only causes, but the primary causes.

But after marriage there is a sort of evening up. A woman's sex emotion is awakened and a great change both physically and mentally occurs. Her economic ability, which previous to her marriage was small, now becomes large, because whereas before marriage it could only be exercised in the open market, a quite unfit place for her abilities, it is now exercised to and through her husband, in which way it may have great value.

This is most clearly seen in the more elementary conditions of society. If the savage woman depends on the man for food and protection, the man depends on the woman for cooking that food, weaving his clothes, and tending him when sick or wounded. The vision of the savage lording over a cowed wife with his club is only an hallucination. Truly he may beat her sometimes, and she may let him starve sometimes from leaving his food uncooked, or she may poison him, but such incidents are rare. There is give and

take between man and woman there as at all periods. I am personally acquainted with savage life and I found that essentially it does not differ from civilized life.

So, too, with the working man. He needs a wife to cook his meals, mend his clothes and make a home for him. He cannot live comfortably unmarried. And in the higher grades the economic help an intelligent woman can give her husband is great. I do not mean only the keeping a home, and a welcome when he comes back from work. I mean economic assistance in his work.

In the Elizabethan days, as I have already said, the wife considered herself a partner with her husband in his business, whatever it might be. An intelligent woman can resolve for a man many difficulties he encounters and assist him in innumerable ways, because she sees persons and events differently from what he does. Many successful business men have given testimony of this, ascribing their success greatly to their wives' assistance, and without any doubt this tribute is not one of affection only, but is true. A man's efficiency is doubled by his wife's efficiency, and *per contra* if his wife be ignorant or stupid, a "lady" who is not interested in the

world of work, or an "angel" who is too good to have anything to do with this wicked world except despise it, he is handicapped beyond all computation.

Men and women are so designed both in strength and weakness as to be absolutely necessary to each other, not in one matter, but in all. A man cannot attain full and healthy development, either of body or brain, without a woman, nor can he succeed even economically so well single as he would if he had a wife like the Elizabethan wives, eager to understand and to help.

But neither can a woman develop to a ripe maturity, or exercise her faculties in business or other wider matters, except through a man.

Man is not therefore to be decried as "lustful," because it is the sex instinct, which is the primary need, which drives him to marriage, nor is a woman to be condemned as "mercenary," because the establishment she will acquire is her first consideration. These are the Maker of Nature's ways, of gaining His object, which is the unity of a man and a woman, the enforcing of the eternal truth that no one lives to himself alone, but in and by others, not in one way alone, but in all. Thus a true marriage only exists where the true relationship of the husband and

wife is always borne in mind and is fulfilled. Marriage is an association where all things, all desires and efforts, all work and all play, are in common, and where there is a mutual sympathy. Following on physical union comes union of the intelligence.

Therefore true marriage, like all other good things, can only be attained by steady and continuous effort rightly directed by the intelligence. Neither men nor women should be allowed to enter into such a relationship blindly, but with a clear understanding of the task before them. They should enter with as far as possible their eyes open to the conditions of marriage.

For unless the union of a man and woman result in a marriage that more or less approximates to what it might be, then it is no true union and is, in fact, a disunion more deadly than separation would be. And such an union is not always within their power. For it must be remembered that even suppose both men and women knew clearly beforehand wherein marriage consists, which is not the case now, a true and continuing marriage is often impossible. The first consideration of Nature in attracting a man to a certain woman is suitable children, and the happiness of the couple is a secondary consideration. Thus

love may draw a man into marriage with a woman quite unsuited in other ways to marriage with him. He may have acquired habits of thought quite at variance with those in which she has been brought up, and as it is for most people an impossible thing to alter habits of mind acquired in youth, no spiritual marriage is possible. Their views on religion, politics, society and innumerable other matters may be antagonistic. Further, a woman may either have been educated to be ignorant of and despise all work or her husband's work may be uncongenial to her. On the other hand, he may have been educated to despise women and may refuse to allow her to know anything about his work.

These differences may be slight or acute, and in such cases it is not the "fault" of either. For "fault" means something that can be repaired, and such differences are irreparable.

Such being bound to be the case, as I say, even if both sides know beforehand what marriage ought to be and where both strive consistently to make it so, how much more frequently it must occur where, as now, on entering on marriage neither side know anything of the subject, or have wrong ideals altogether. Physical attraction soon fades, and unless intellectual attraction ensue

repulsion takes place on both sides. That again is a wise provision of Nature, which has no use for things which are neither one thing or another. Nature, in order to the efficiency of life, requires true marriages, and where this does not take place she sets up a reaction of repulsion so that the atoms may either seek elsewhere mates more suitable to them, or at all events may live in peace apart. For to keep a man and woman together who have no spiritual unity is a truly disastrous thing, for the individuals themselves, for the children, and for the community.

Let us consider what happens :

A man living under the perpetual irritation of uncongenial companionship very rapidly loses his efficiency for really good work. His temperament is disturbed and his mental balance follows. He is a bad master and a bad servant. He either loses heart for work or he devotes himself too much to it and so becomes narrow. The music of life has become a perpetual discord, and no one can act well to such an accompaniment. Then he absents himself from home and seeks relief elsewhere. The woman ceases to interest herself in her husband's career and so loses touch with the world, she may also seek society elsewhere, or more frequently still she calls in as her adviser

in all her domestic affairs, which are her husband's also, either a priest or a doctor, and surrenders herself absolutely to their influence. And the man says to himself: "By what right am I obliged to support and live with a woman who has no interest in me or my work?"

Probably both man and woman suffer equally, but both are not equally capable of bearing domestic or other trouble. Women are constitutionally better able to bear pain than men, as the medical profession knows, for operations which might kill men are well borne by women, and this lower sensitiveness seems to extend to other matters also. It is, I am told, a matter of statistics in all countries that men more frequently succumb, commit suicide, break down, go mad, or suffer in similar ways, from domestic trouble than women do.

As there is nothing more disastrous to the well-being both of man or woman than incompatibility, so there is nothing more injurious to the well-being of children. They are very quick to observe what is hidden from the outside world, and they are either torn this way and that or they take sides. They learn to despise either one parent or both, and their active minds are devoted to criticism of matters they cannot understand.

The effect is seen in their after-lives, for in childhood, their seed-time, the evil seeds of unhappiness and contention have been sown to bear bitter fruit hereafter.

An old lady, who was a very wise old lady and whom I knew in my young manhood, had many counsels on the subject of marriage, and this was one of them :

" If when you are intending to marry you retain enough intelligence to reflect about what you are doing, remember this : Choose a girl whose father and mother live together happily. A girl brought up in such a home knows what a home is, knows something of the give and take of married life and wherein its happiness consists. She has learnt in the best of all ways the mutual dependence of sex. She will have a happy tradition to bring to you.

" If you cannot find such a girl, then marry a girl who has only known one parent—it doesn't matter which. She will not be worth the first. Even to a girl a father is very necessary. Remember what George Sand says : 'Je crois que l'éducation d'une femme ne doit pas être dirigée exclusivement par des femmes, à moins qu'on ne la destine au cloître.' A girl who has known only one parent may be narrow,

obstinate and ignorant, but at any rate she will have learnt nothing bad, and very likely she will do well.

"But never, never marry a girl whose father and mother, though on bad or indifferent terms, continue to live together for any reason whatever, because it is 'respectable,' or because they vowed it, or for the 'sake of the children.' They ought to have separated, and divided the children. If not, the girl grows up with a tradition of home unhappiness, of sex antagonism, of inefficiency and pretence, and she will bring you nothing but misery.

"It doesn't so much matter for the boys, because their education is not so entirely a home affair, but it matters for them, too, and I tell girls to avoid sons from homes where there is no harmony."

But as I have already said, man loses his reason when he falls in love. It is Nature's provision to make him marry, and to cause him unconsciously to select the mate with whom the most successful children will be born. He has to make the best of things as they are.

The greatest sufferer of all is the community. It not only suffers through the decreased efficiency of man, woman and children, but because the

whole matter of marriage is thereby degraded and made a subject of scoff and dislike. False standards are set up when pretence is mistaken for reality, respectability for happiness, a chain for the bond of mutual attraction. Communities must be held together not by force but by mutual understanding and help, and if in marriage these fail and yet the cohabitation is forcibly maintained the falsity affects the whole structure of society.

It will be seen, then, that the relationship of the sexes is one of the most important matters—perhaps the most important social matter—and that unless it be satisfactory nothing can go well. The man and woman together form the primary cell in all communities, and if this be unhealthy nothing can be healthy.

Laws and conventions regarding the sexes require, therefore, to be successful, the deepest knowledge of humanity, so that they work to help Nature to attain all her ends.

CHAPTER VIII

MARRIAGE

ONE would suppose, therefore, that every Government would have made it one of its first duties to institute a Department of State to study this matter and to frame such laws and conventions as would seem best suited to secure all the objects mentioned. Further, that having framed these laws and conventions, it would watch their working most carefully and alter them from time to time, so as to bring them into harmony with changing circumstances. For although in essentials man is always the same, he varies greatly in details from time to time, because he is subject to evolution. Circumstances also change, and laws and conventions to work well must accord not only with human nature but with outside circumstances, and vary as do they. For instance, laws suitable

to a people in a normal state, when the males and females are equal, would require some slight modification where the waste of men from war or other causes was so great as to leave a large proportion of women who could obtain no husbands and consequently live a narrow life and bear no children. Again, laws giving small facilities for divorce may be tolerated in healthy communities in normal times, where both men and women enter into marriage with an understanding of what is necessary and where good example is frequent. But in times of change and stress, when old things are passing and the nation is restless, there is need for the utmost facility of divorce, or matters become intolerable.

Economic changes also render necessary alterations in the laws of property in and out of marriage.

No State, however, has ever had such a Department. In the early days the laws and conventions of sex were generally laid down once for all by some great man who reconstituted the State, such as Menu and Solon, and these laws, being based on experience and reason, were satisfactory at the time. They were suited to the people and their then circumstances.

For instance, Montaigne says: "We have

thought to tie the nuptial knot of our marriages more fast and firm by taking away all means of dissolving it: but the knot of the will and the affection is so much the more slackened and made loose by how much that of constraint is drawn closer; and on the contrary, that which kept the marriages of Rome so long in honour and inviolate was the liberty everyone who so desired had to break them; they kept their wives the better because they might part with them if they would, and in the full liberty of divorce five hundred years and more passed before anyone made use of it."

These laws, however, became out of date because unsuitable to the changing circumstances.

There is not in this, any more than in other social matters, a rigid rule of right and wrong which exists independent of results. Those laws and conventions are best which have the best results for all concerned, for married and unmarried, for parents, children and the community; that is to say, whose total is the most satisfactory. What, then, did our Government do to attain this?

They abdicated all power and authority, and handed the subject over to priests to regulate according to their own ideas. And what were

the ideas of the Church to this emotion, which is the principal emotion of life, the base of all other emotions and the cause of the continuance of life? Their attitude, no matter what the Church, has been consistent throughout; they have condemned it, root and branch, in every form and every way. From the very beginning up till to-day, the sex instinct has been the cursed thing. To the early Christian, Love was simply an impulse of the devil, and it was an early Christian form of high devotion for men and women to lie in bed together, and while arousing the desire, deny it satisfaction.

And so it continued throughout the early ages. Chastity, that is to say, the denial and repudiation of sex, was the highest Christian virtue, and no one who broke it could expect to do well hereafter. See Revelation, for instance. They discouraged marriage in every way, and they did so succeed that Italy became depopulated and demoralized, and it was Attila and the Huns who stung it back into life.

Again, at the end of the tenth century, priests succeeded in abstracting so many men and women from active to religious life—the eleven thousand virgins of Cologne will not be forgotten—that there was a danger of Western Europe,

demoralized and depopulated by such ideas, being over-run by other and more intelligent people. Then Nature reasserted herself and a reaction came with the troubadours and chivalry, which was a cult of love. And at last the Church, recognizing that they could not continue to suppress it without losing their power over humanity, decided to modify their attitude. It was still to be counted as evil, men and women were still far more likely to attain their priest-imagined heaven if they refused to exercise this emotion, but "mankind was weak" (meaning that Nature and the Creator of Nature was too strong for them), and so love must be allowed. But it was to be permitted only to a minimum extent, and only under priestly sanction.

They instituted the sacrament of marriage. What was this sacrament? It was simply this: no man and no woman were to exercise this function of Nature except by prior permission of the priests. This permission required both parties to swear an oath to do things which, with the best will in the world, no one knows if he can do or not, and whether he did or did not do so, this oath was permanent. Marriage, therefore, consisted of a ceremony and a formula. Nothing else was essential. The formula once

uttered, the conduct of the parties to each other was quite immaterial. They could fight, commit any offence towards each other, render their common life a misery, ruin their lives, and injure their children and the community—and still it was marriage.

It is true that the Church gave the man and woman advice, and even made them swear "to love, honour and obey," to "love and to cherish," but these were only words. If the unhappy couple did not and could not do any of these things, it made no difference. Marriage in the eyes of priests was not a physical followed by a spiritual union, but a formula. The formula once pronounced, nothing else mattered. The truth of reality could not prevail against the mirage of words. The latter were final.

That is not a high ideal to place before married couples, it is disastrous.

And if it be declared that it was the Church of Rome that did this, and that this was superseded at the Reformation, the answer is that as far as marriage went there was no change.

It is true that the Protestant Churches do not advocate the retirement of men and women into convents, and that priests are allowed to marry, but that denotes no change of principle.

These are concessions allowed "to the weakness of humanity." "It is better to marry than burn." The sex emotion remains still to them the accursed thing as is shown, for instance, by their declaration in baptism that every child, though born according to the design of the Creator and by processes invented by Him, and even if of a marriage sanctified by priests, is still "born in sin," and must be sprinkled with water and words by a priest, or be damned. Nothing could be clearer than that.

And when in the last century, secular marriage was allowed, and a State formula substituted for a Church formula, nothing was really changed.

Even the establishment of divorce made practically no difference, for it was not instituted to give relief to unhappy couples or to establish a higher standard of marriage duty, but for a totally different reason. The State wanted someone to punish, and so if one party to a marriage was unfaithful, the other could have him or her punished by dissolution of the marriage, involving loss of the children and pecuniary punishment as well. That there was no intention of raising the standard of married life is clearly shown by the fact that if not merely one but *both* parties are unfaithful, no divorce is possible. And that

it was not instituted out of care for the children is shown not only by this last-mentioned fact, but by the further fact that divorces, instead of being done quietly and privately as befits the washing of such dirty linen, must be done publicly, and so brand the children's futures.

Even such very slight relief as is afforded by these laws of divorce is forbidden to the poor because such cases are not only—like all English law—very expensive,* but they can only be tried in London.

As for the community, the law has never recognized that there is such a thing.

Such is the spirit, the spirit of hate, in which our sex laws have been framed, and such are the laws. What are the results ?

And as concrete cases do very often illustrate the effect of laws more vividly than general discussion, I will first give a few instances that have quite recently come into my notice. They are not exceptional, but are as far as the principles are concerned very common cases. Neither have I selected them because of their badness. On the contrary, I know of many cases, cases

* A timid attempt, copied from French procedure, has been made recently to reduce the costs to the poor. It is quite unsatisfactory.

within my own knowledge, quite recent cases, so dreadful that I could not write of them.

* * * * *

(1) The man was a gardener, the woman a farmer's daughter. They had been in love as boy and girl, and intended to marry when they could. But a gardener is not well paid, and furnishings cost money, so they had to wait. They used to walk in the woods on Sunday evenings in summer, and what is natural and inevitable occurred. Presently, however, she found she was about to be a mother, and so, in spite of difficulties, they were married. But when, four months later, a child was born, the "righteous" in the village saw their chance to persecute someone. The man's employer was induced by the vicar to dismiss him without a character and he was ruined. They left the village and I don't know what became of them.

* * * * *

(2) A case similar to No. 1, only that when the young man found the girl was about to be a mother, rather than marry her and then be

dismissed, held up to scorn and ruined, with a wife and child to support, he secretly gave notice, got his character, and fled. The girl was abandoned, and the child was branded as a "child of sin."

* * * * *

(3) The man was a professional man and well off, a man of considerable ability and of the strong desires which usually go with it. He adored his wife, but she discovered soon after marriage, and after bearing one child, that she didn't like him, and wanted an escape. Sensible marriage laws would allow a divorce, for feelings like this are not under our control and she was not to blame. It was Nature's warning to her that she should bear no more children, at least by that husband. But our laws allow no relief, and so she had to make up a scheme. She closed her room to him, and he, after bearing it for a while, found his power of work affected by this enforced celibacy, and sought relief elsewhere. His wife, expecting this, had him watched, and very soon got satisfactory evidence. Legal cruelty was easily shown, and she not only got a divorce and got the child, but got

maintenance for life from the husband she had driven into infidelity.

He was ruined. Such cases are not uncommon, and the reverse also happens sometimes, only the husband does not get maintenance from the wife.

* * * * *

(4) The man owned an hotel which had a bar and a barmaid. His wife, always passionately jealous, conceived a great dislike of one barmaid in particular, and made things so uncomfortable the girl had to go. She got another position in the same town, but the jealous wife pursued her there and told the proprietor that the girl was a loose woman and had immoral relations with her husband.

The girl was again dismissed and brought an action for slander, conclusively proved her case that the whole story was false, and got heavy damages—against the husband, who was as much injured as she was. But according to law, a wife acts under her husband's authority, no matter what she does, and he has to stand all responsibility. That hotel-keeper was not only made a laughing-stock of, his life made a misery

and his pocket heavily punished, but the wife went scot free. He could not even obtain a legal separation from her.

* * * * *

(5) A man suspected his wife's fidelity and had her watched. He soon obtained complete evidence of her infidelity. Then he, though a poor man, scraped together money enough to present a petition in divorce. The wife defended the case and incurred considerable legal expenses in trying to escape, but the evidence was conclusive. The man got his divorce—and besides his own heavy costs, had to pay those his wife had incurred in fighting against him. He was ruined. This case was reported in the papers.

* * * * *

And now, turning from particular cases, which are only illustrations, to a general consideration of the whole subject, what is the effect of these laws on the country as a whole ?

And here I would again use a metaphor I used in Chapter I., because it expresses an important truth. A man is put in charge of a boiler that

supplies a factory with steam, and told to regulate it as he thinks right. He, however, does not begin by studying the laws of the expansion of steam so as to know how best to use it; but, on the contrary, he dislikes steam altogether as dangerous, and he only admits that it must be used at all because he does not see how to stop it. Consequently, he decides to allow only the narrowest possible exit. The steam, however, following its laws, expands, and not being able to escape from the one exit provided, it makes many illegitimate exits. The result is that not only is much useful steam wasted, but that which escapes from the illicit exits scalds and injures everything about it, so that the whole factory is in a bad state. That man and those who put him in charge cannot say "The steam which comes out of the right exit is good moral steam, whereas, that which escapes elsewhere is wicked and immoral. This devastation is not our fault at all. If all steam was as righteous as that which comes out of the escape allowed, all would be well. But the nature of steam is hopelessly evil, and hence the trouble," or if they said so, we should laugh at them.

It is not otherwise with the sex emotion. However it may vary in individuals, it is an

universal emotion, and it follows general laws of its own. It no more than the steam is amenable to laws you invent for it. If you make artificial laws that offend against those natural laws and disaster results, which it is certain to do, the fault is yours. You cannot divide up causes and results. It is not only happy marriages that are the result of our marriage laws, but the unhappy marriages also, the illegal unions, the illegitimate children, the prostitution and its consequent disease, and all the volume of crime that is caused. All of these are as absolutely the result of our wrong marriage laws as the illicit escape of steam would be the result of ignorant management of the boiler. You must treat the subject as a whole.

What, then, more exactly are the results of our marriage laws? They have been always and they are now exactly what might be expected.

It is not possible for most men to keep this emotion entirely unused until marriage. Before a man marries it is necessary for him to establish himself in some career so that he may have a house and an income suitable to his position in life to which he can bring his wife, for as a rule the woman now brings nothing to the household. Even with manual workers, who attain this posi-

tion comparatively early, a man may be well towards thirty before he feels it safe to marry, and with brain workers it is often much later. Moreover, there is a general feeling among men who can afford to wait, that as marriage is irreparable it were as well to put it off as long as can be conveniently done, so that if it turn out to be an error, as most married men tell him it is, he may suffer from it as little as possible. But if a man remain "chaste" until that advanced period, serious results occur. No man with whom this emotion is not rightly and properly used can develop his nature, either physically or mentally in due balance. Nature makes strong and urgent demands, and if these demands be not met she revenges herself. The woman prude is bad, but the man prude is the most dangerous of pharisees. He loses his humanity and his intelligence becomes clouded. It leads also to other evils. Moreover if a man remain with this emotion repressed and unexercised it, like all emotions that are not duly used, tends to wane, and he does not want to marry at all; even if he do marry, his children are not satisfactory. Consequently men break this rule almost universally, with the result of prostitution and disease. By general consent this is condoned as far as the man is concerned,

public opinion even in intelligent women recognizing that it is inevitable. But the full force of priestly and feminine revenge is poured out on these poor women, who are really doing the State a great service, but who are denounced and harried in consequence. No man likes prostitution, nor does any woman, but for the man there is no alternative, except either seducing his neighbours' wives or injuring his constitution, and for the woman who has once satisfied the emotion Nature gave her, except under priestly or State sanction, there is no recovery allowed. She is denied all opportunity of marriage or of work, and she must be a prostitute to live.

Yet these women do the State a great service. That is not to say that prostitution is good, it is a terrible evil, and nowhere does it flourish to anything like the same extent as in the Christian countries of Europe, more especially since the marriage laws became more rigid. It is the inevitable result of bad laws, and the only way to cause it to cease is to render it unnecessary by having good and reasonable laws that will encourage early marriage, by teaching true ideals of marriage, and by allowing a reasonable escape from unfortunate marriages.

Until then prostitution will continue, and with

it that terrible disease which it has introduced—a disease unknown to early nations, but which is said to have originated in Europe in the dark ages of the Church and has from there spread everywhere. We have recently had a Royal Commission on the subject and its Report, like other such Reports, entirely evades the whole question. It proposes to bestow secret and irresponsible power on a certain class of men and so make matters worse. You cannot cure any disease except by removing the cause.

The children born of illicit unions are called children of sin, are denied any acknowledgment by their fathers, not that the father is unnatural, but because society would ruin him if he did as his natural affection dictates, and looked after the child, and consequently such children, if girls, often have to become prostitutes in their turn, and if boys, as the records show, they end in gaols or pauperism. Yet such children—love children—are naturally above the average, as the experience of all nations has always shown. There were 35,000 such children born in England in 1914.

Then there are the great numbers of single women who, unable to find any man to accept them, blindly, for good or ill, as life partners, live unhappy, narrow lives because denied

their proper sexual development and suitable economic opportunities. No country has so many as England. There are the scandalous divorce cases and there are the separation cases, especially among the poor, which as everyone knows, are simply incentives to wrong. And finally there are the great number of unhappy marriages.

As to these last everyone will form his own opinion, but the suffragettes for the women's side have declared what they think of the average marriage, and for the men's side the heavy enlistments of married men early in the war told its own tale. All these are the direct and inevitable result of laws like ours.

* * * * *

What, then, would a New England do ? When she has found her Soul how will she act in the matter of the sex relation ?

She will have a Ministry of Justice, and in that office, I think, a Department whose duty it will be to watch over these matters of sex. The Board at the head will consist not, I think, of men and women, but of men assisted by their wives, not quite the same thing.

This Department will study the matter from all sides and will frame the new laws. It will also be its duty to rescue this question of sex from ecclesiastics on the one side and poets and romancers on the other, and create a healthy public understanding of the questions involved. The laws and conventions once framed will not be considered final, but the Department will watch over their effect and will present yearly to the new House of Commons a report on their working and suggestions for alteration to meet deficiencies or changes.

As to the main lines on which the new laws should be framed, there will not be much difficulty about that, because they are apparent in human nature.

Nor will there, I think, be much difficulty as to what the conventions ought to be.

The only difficulty will lie with those who claim to themselves a supernatural knowledge of all matters and who wish to remain our masters till the end.

But when England has found her Soul she will be free. She will abide no masters, but will regulate her affairs in accordance with common sense and the determination to make the best and not the worst of that emotion that the Designer

of the world has used and uses as His chief instrument in the evolution of life. Then will marriage become a true bond of attraction, instead of a "chain"* and prostitution and disease will disappear.

* *Vinculum matrimonium,* the Church expression.

CHAPTER IX

MAKERS OF CRIME

TO the health of a State, that it should have true standards of right and wrong and a due sense of the responsibility of all and each for the well-being of the community, there is nothing more important than just laws. For when men are encouraged in ill-doing by the example or by the assistance of the State it is impossible that any right standard should be observed in any matter. The laws should be in accordance with that sense of justice that is innate in all of us, they should be founded on a true understanding of human nature, their action should be prompt, simple and cheap, and no advantage should be given by them to any class. That will, I think, be accepted as an axiom.

What will, however, not be so readily accepted perhaps, is the further statement that none of these principles obtain in England to-day. The

laws are unjust, sometimes to an extraordinary degree, they are not based on any knowledge of human nature, they are complex, absurd and dilatory, and not only by the law itself but by the methods of procedure such enormous advantage is given to the rich over the poor that to all intents and purposes law is bought and sold in England to-day as much as it ever was in any country at any period. The reason this will not be accepted at once is not because there is any doubt about the facts, they are patent to everyone who cares to look into the matter, but because, lawyers apart, no one does look into the matter or care to know anything about it.

It is a maxim of law that everyone is supposed to know the law; it is a fact, worth a ton of maxims, that even lawyers only know the law very imperfectly, and the generality of English people know nothing whatever about it. They accept it blindly, placidly, too content with ignorance to care for knowledge. They have a fund of sayings that they prefer instead of knowledge: "In England every man is held to be innocent till he is proved guilty," "Every man has a fair trial," "Flogging stopped garrotting," "Imprisonment for debt is abolished"—none of which are true or even near the truth. And so

the evil continues unchecked and even grows. For it is not in this detail or that where the law fails, but because its very fundamental ideas are wrong. It starts from wrong assumptions, and so it cannot be completely right in any matter.

But when England has found her Soul, nay, to the finding of that Soul, she must have just and true laws. The State must set to the individual an example of truth and justice, it should lead and not lag, as it does now, in the dark ages. Therefore let us consider the English system of Law.

Now Law is really an unit and there is no exact partition between Criminal and Civil Law. They merge into each other and are related to each other so closely that a true division is impossible, and when we have a real science of Law this will be recognized and the present artificial division done away with. It is harmful in many ways, as all false classifications are. But meanwhile, and for the sake of brevity, it will be convenient here to observe this division and to treat Criminal and Civil Law in separate chapters, as if they were separate things, Criminal Law being concerned with offences against the State, and Civil Law being concerned with private wrongs. In Criminal Law there is punishment, in Civil Law there

is theoretically only restitution or compensation; in the first the State prosecutes, in the second the individual.

Let us take Criminal Law first.

I wonder how many English people have had any experience of Police Courts and of Criminal Courts, have seen as I have the daily unhappy tale of prisoners to be tried for the same offences, to be acquitted or to be convicted and sent to gaol.

I wonder, too, how many are acquainted with the gaols and their working, have seen the prisoners come in frightened, miserable, stunned, have seen them suffer in the gaol, have seen them sent forth again not better, stronger men and women, but hardened now, vindictive against the State that has acted to them with such want of understanding, criminals now until they die.

Very few, I think. For the most part the people I meet seem to think that such things concern them not at all. Crime is the business of the Courts and the police can attend to it. As long as a man has committed no crime himself he thinks that he is free from crime, that while he pays taxes for police and Courts and gaols he has done his duty. That such a plague-spot exists in our national life seems to him no concern of

his, the infection does not reach him. With myself it has always been otherwise. This great volume of crime and the complete inefficiency of our methods of dealing with it have seemed to me a shameful thing, shameful not only for the criminals, but to everyone in the nation, shameful to me who am but the tiniest cell in the nation, shameful to you also. As no part of a human body can be in full health if a great sore exist in that body, so it is with a nation. This constant stream of crime is in some sense our crime, too, your crime and mine. That is how I have felt and feel. What, then, is the cause of crime ?

I do not think that those who have studied crime carefully, having full opportunity for doing so, have ever been in doubt as to its causes. They are written clearly in the records of the crime of the nation, in the regularity of crime, in its fluctuations up and down, in its relation to other matters. They are also evident in individual cases, why this crime or that was committed, in the primary causes that led eventually to the crime and the criminal. They are, I say, simple and evident. The primary causes of crime are poverty, ill-health, want of education, and bad laws, somewhat in the order given, and

compared with these all other causes are secondary and slight. Let us consider these causes.

In the first place, you will see that these causes are not individual defects, are not faults of the criminal himself, but are faults of society. They are defects in the Nation. The organism as a whole is sick, and owing to this sickness, certain cells are not sufficiently nourished. Consequently, disease seizes on them and they succumb. In a healthy organism that would not occur. In a nation that was truly organized and where all men had their rights, those rights I have already partly explained, there would be no poverty. There would be rich and poor, of course, but none would be below the line of decent living; in the first place, because in a truly organized society everyone would be able to earn a decent livelihood; and secondly, because if any individual did show signs of failure, his community would *for its own sake* see that he was assisted to a better use of his powers. Poverty is never the wilful fault of the individual who suffers it. The misery of poverty is so great that no one would shrink from any possible effort to escape it. If he does not do so, it is because his health is bad, due to malnutrition in youth, or he is ignorant, or he has fallen into

bad habits, and all of these are due to the folly and selfishness of the community. It is the duty of the community—such communities as I have described—to see that all children are so brought up as to be a credit to it, and not the reverse. There should be no unskilled man or woman in England, there will be none when England wakes to her duty. There will be none seeking help and not finding it—help that is due, not as a charity, but as a right. Who is there to help anyone nowadays? There are plenty of people, judges, priests and pharisees, to condemn, to punish, to persecute; but to prevent or help, who is there? As the old seaman with whom I discussed these matters the other day said to me: "Life in England, sir, is like the rush to the theatre door at a cry of fire. If you trip and fall there are a thousand to tread you down, and not one to help you up."

Then as to bad laws, take the following very common case. A workman's wife is blandished and swindled by a tallyman into buying some rubbish, a watch, a gramophone, or a family Bible, on the instalment plan. The workman falls temporarily out of work, and the instalments cannot be paid. He is County Courted and sent to gaol for debt, his home is broken up and his

wife sent to the workhouse. If that man, on his release, wage war upon society for the bitter wrong it has done him, whose is the fault? Who made him into a criminal? Is it a right thing to declare, as is generally done quite falsely, that imprisonment for debt has been abolished in England, whereas, of civilized countries England is the only one where it has not been abolished? The rich man, it is true, is safeguarded. The company promoter who has ruined thousands can settle everything on his wife, and file his petition in bankruptcy and so avoid arrest, and soon be going strong again, but the poor man cannot do so. He cannot put his brains and arms, his only capital, in his wife's name, he cannot enter the bankruptcy court, for the Court only shelters those who owe over £50, and who can pay the Court £10 to take the petition. So the workman goes to gaol. Since "imprisonment for debt was abolished," over 300,000 persons have so been imprisoned, and millions have been threatened with it unless their friends or relations paid up for them, to avoid the shame. What is this but a sort of blackmail? How many criminals does this law make every year?

Take, then, another point. There are many

criminal offences, and there are innumerable misdemeanours for which a fine may be given as punishment. A person may be fined for being drunk and disorderly, for assault, or riot, or driving a motor car dangerously, or walking on grass, or infringing the by-laws of a railway company, or for innumerable other matters. So far, I have no criticism to make. But surely, if it is necessary to punish by fine, some calculation ought to be made as to the amount of fine to inflict. For instance, to fine a millionaire and a taxi-cab driver each £2 for an identical breach of the rules of the road is not fair. To the rich man it is nothing, to the poor man it is a dreadful punishment. Say the rich man has even as little as £2,000 a year, a fine of £2 is little more than one-third of a day's income; it is the cost of stalls at the theatre, and a supper for self and friend; to the taxi-cab driver it is a week's income, it is the whole subsistence of himself, his wife and children, for seven days. The former can always pay such a trifle, the latter very often cannot, and so goes to gaol, not because he has done anything deserving of gaol, but simply and purely because he is poor. His career is ruined, his reputation and that of his children stained, his home probably

broken up, *because he is poor*, and for no other reason whatever. If he takes to crime as a livelihood, who made him a criminal ?

And as a last example, take our sex laws. How many men and women are driven to drink, to crime, even to murder, because they are riveted to uncongenial partners ? And most unhappy of all, there is the girl-mother, who, in a frenzy of despair at the future the righteous of this world are preparing for her and her newly-born baby, prefers to appeal rather to the humanity of God than to the inhumanity of men, and sends her baby's soul back to Him who gave it.

Surely, if there is anyone in this world who deserves our sympathy, our help, our protection and encouragement, it is she. Our Courts think otherwise, for they sentence her "to be hanged by the neck till she is dead." And if the sentence be not carried out, it is "an act of grace."

Such are examples of our English law. And remember I am not bringing forward exceptional cases, they are fair samples of the whole.

"But," it will be objected, "granted that all this is true, still the criminal has no excuse. He should bear his troubles and not allow him-

self to make them an excuse for falling into crime. That is no palliation of his conduct."

Have you ever read of John Bradford, who when he saw a criminal go by on the way to execution said, "But for the grace of God there goes John Bradford"? He and many other men have known that. Had he, too, been treated as the criminal, he had been the criminal. Do you think you are so wise, so strong, so righteous, that no provocation would make you sin? Have you never sinned without any provocation? And is it not rather you who are trying to excuse yourself for supporting a form of society which does all these wrong things by throwing the blame on the unhappy sufferers. Society wronged them first, wronged them in their childhood by neglect, in their manhood by bad treatment. You began it, and it is for you to amend yourself first. Surely it is a pitiful thing for a great and wealthy nation to seek excuse for its own ill-doing by throwing the blame on those who suffer from it. Put yourself right first, and when you have done this, you will have no more criminals to blame—because there will be none. And, until then, never suppose but that the larger share of the crime is yours—yours and mine, until we have obtained better things.

You say that you hate crime: cease then to cause it.

Meanwhile, as long as crime is caused, no matter who was the cause, it must be dealt with. We must have police, and magistrates and gaols. Let us consider our criminal law and procedure now, and see what it does.

A crime has been committed, the police make inquiries and a man is arrested—what then? It is in the interest of the police that the man be convicted. Their reputation will suffer otherwise, and promotion to certain individuals may or may not come. They have behind them to enforce their view of the case all the resources of the Government. They have unlimited money, unlimited authority, agents everywhere, skilled advocates. What has the accused? He is locked up, and as his relations will generally abandon him, unless a friend steps in he is alone. He can engage a lawyer if he can afford it, and if not he goes without. The ability of his lawyer depends on the amount the prisoner can pay. That lawyer has no agents, has probably no money for expenses, he has opposed to him all the forces of the Crown fighting for a conviction.

Is that fair? Is it conducive to justice?

for, in order that justice may be obtained, the case for both sides should be equally well managed, equally well presented. A trial is really a duel, it is the direct descendant of the duels of the Middle Ages, and it is not very long ago that the actual resort to the arbitrament of the sword could be pleaded as a bar to trial before a Judge. The two sides fight by their champions, their weapons are evidence true or false. The Judge is referee, the Jury are the arbiters. The Judge has no power to make any inquiries himself. He has to accept what is given him, no matter how inadequate.

In a duel between the Crown and the prisoner, who is poor, how much chance has the latter unless the case is obvious ?

Again, even if the actual facts of the crime be simple, that is not or ought not to be enough. No crime stands as an isolated action, generally it is the culminating point of many actions of many people. A has killed B, or C has robbed D. So much is clear, but why ? Did B give A long and serious provocation ? Unless the provocation was given at the moment of the murder the law does not consider that. Did D provoke the theft ? The law does not consider that either. Yet both are essential points

towards any system of justice. For instance, as regards the last point, let me tell a personal experience. I had two Burmese servants who had recently come into my service, and whom I liked and wished to keep. One day the elder came to me and said he had something serious to say. I answered, "Say on," and this is what he told me.

"We have been your servants for two years, and we hope to be so till you return to Belat. But you must treat us fairly or we cannot stay."

"In what way do I treat you unfairly?" I asked.

"You are, compared to us, a very rich man. You pay us fair wages, but yet we are poor. The other servants are poorer. We all are honest, but you do not help us to remain so."

"No?" I asked.

"No," he said. "You leave money about, you leave gold ornaments and silver about, you leave your keys about. That is not fair. If, in a moment of temptation, a servant took anything of yours you would get the police, and he would be ruined for life. Yet it would be your fault."

"That is true," I answered. "What should I do?"

"You pay me and my brother enough, but the other servants are underpaid. They have not enough to live on. Give them a few rupees more. And keep valuables locked up. If you want us to be honest, help us to be so," was his answer, and he went away.

I kept my servants fourteen years, and I never lost the smallest trifle.

Do Courts, or Society, ever think as simply and as honestly as my Burmese boy? They never do.

Practically no case is thrashed out, because neither the law nor the procedure lends itself to thoroughness. And sometimes gross miscarriages occur. Is the Beck case forgotten? If so, surely the Starchfield case is not. True, Starchfield was not convicted, but that was not the fault either of the police nor the magistrate. And because other cases are not boomed by the papers, do you think they are rare? But nothing else could be expected of such a system, where one half the case is got up by the State and the other half is left to the unhappy prisoner's limited resources.

Well, the prisoner is either acquitted or convicted, what then? If he is acquitted is any compensation made to him for what he has

wrongly had to suffer; are his expenses even paid? Not in the least. The law may have ruined him, does ruin many innocent people, but the law does not care. You do not care, for the law represents you and stands for you. Is it not your business to see that the law acts rightly?

And if he is convicted, what is done with him? Is he so treated as to leave a prison a wiser and a better man, able now to earn his own living and avoid that poverty which is the main cause of crime?

Not so. He is punished, that is to say, Society revenges itself on him, and he leaves gaol worse than before. He is now usually ruined for life, embittered, and brutalized, and he, in his turn, seeks revenge. Is that satisfactory? All the worst crime is committed by men who have been in gaol. So the game of retaliation goes on. Society began it and Society thinks it has the last word when it has hanged or imprisoned for life the criminals it has made.

The Pharisees, too, think that as they send the criminal to hell, hereafter they will be done with him. Well, I wonder if it will be so. My own idea is that it will be otherwise. Life is eternal, and in the end Justice is sure to get

her own, and in the eye of Justice, if the receiver be worse than the thief, those who by supporting false forms of Society and bad laws create the criminals, are worse even than the receivers. I am still more unorthodox in this, that I do not think the reign of Justice and happiness should be left to God to bring in some future state, but that we should bring it to pass here and now ourselves. I have no doubt we can if we choose.

* * * * *

Crime, then, as everyone who has studied it knows, is a disease of the community finding expression in the individual. It is, for instance, like small-pox, which does not originate in the patient, but is a dirt disease bred of insanitary surroundings, bad drainage, bad ventilation, bad social conditions, and which seizes on the individual because he is less able to resist it than others. There is no heredity in crime any more than in genius or ability, but differing from genius it is very contagious. Children catch it from their parents or surroundings. In a State which had just laws, where all children were properly brought up, mentally and physically, and where the social conditions were such that each could earn a sufficient livelihood, live a

free life and find an outlet for their special ability, there would be little or no crime.

The first object, therefore, before the State which wishes to stop crime is to attain those conditions as soon as possible—no State now is within reasonable distance of them—and until then so to deal with what crime does occur as to prevent its recurrence, to stamp it out as with an outbreak of disease.

The primary object, then, of Penal Laws is not to punish crime, nor to be revenged on the individual, nor to gratify passions of hatred and self-righteousness—as exhibited recently in the House of Commons—but *to prevent crime*. Everything should be subordinate to this.

When, therefore, a crime occurs the duty of the State is (1) to find the best, the simplest and the most just way to discover who committed the crime, and then (2) so to deal with him that the effect both on him and the public is to prevent its recurrence.

As to the first, I do not think the new Ministry of Justice will have much difficulty in working out a system that will at any rate be a great advance on the present. I have myself made some suggestions elsewhere * and in fact in this,

* "The Passing of Empire."

as other matters, if you have got your foundation ideas right the methods are quickly discoverable. And the foundation idea of all criminal procedure is that to be just, and therefore successful, the whole of both sides must be known. That is not the principle now. Not very long ago a prisoner was not even allowed counsel, it is only in the last few years he has been allowed to speak. Yet all criminals guilty of a first offence wish to confess, if there was only some just person to listen to them. But the police are interested parties and the magistrate has no powers; he is only a referee.

When we get a Ministry of Justice, actuated not by law but by common sense, it will soon find out a way.

If acquitted the accused should be reimbursed his expenditure and compensated for his sufferings.

And if convicted what should be done with him?

Well, there are two things you must not do—you must not let your detestation of the crime lead you into a savage revenge upon the criminal, and you must not let your feelings of regret and sorrow for the human being who has come to such a condition mainly through faults of the com-

munity lead you into a mistaken sentimentality. I am afraid I do not agree with Portia about mercy. It is the swing of the pendulum back from revenge. Justice knows neither one nor the other. Having never been revengeful it never needs to show mercy. You must keep your head and remember what your object ought always to be, the Prevention of Crime. A crime has been committed, it has been brought home to the prisoner—what is to be done with him ?

Let us take an analogous case ; a man has small-pox ; he is in a horrible state and a great danger to the community—what are you going to do with him ? You will not revenge yourself on him, although he may have contracted it partly by his own fault, nor let him go free to infect others, because you are sorry for him—you are going to cure him and prevent the recurrence in him and others. You segregate him and you submit him to whatever treatment you know is curative, however rigid and painful, and you discharge him cured.

So it should be and is not with the criminal. He is punished and that is all that is thought of.

The interests of the State and of the individual are the same, and that should never be forgotten in this or any other matters.

Now punishment, if of the right kind and applied in the right way, may be a means—sometimes it is the only means—of cure and prevention. It may cure the prisoner and also by fear deter others doing the like. If it do so, and in so far as it does so, you are justified in using it ; in so far as it does not do so you are doing more harm than good, for you are degrading not only your patient but yourself. Too heavy punishments have this effect. They degrade the judges who order them and the people who allow them and they do not decrease crime but increase it. This has been repeatedly proved in practice, and for a careful exposition of the subject I would refer the reader to the introduction to the German Code. Flogging did not stop garrotting, for no one ever was flogged for garrotting ; it ceased before the Act even was passed. Capital punishment for theft over five shillings did not stop theft in England. It increased it, because losers would not complain and juries would not convict. The deterrent effect on others of heavy punishments is very small, for one reason because no criminal ever contemplates being caught, but they are horribly degrading to those who allow them for other than remedial purposes.

Are our punishments and penal treatment

conducted on this principle? Not in the least. Notwithstanding recent improvements the main principle they follow is one of revenge, and so crime remains and released criminals are worse than when they enter. They return to ordinary life to commit more grievous crimes than before, and the State suffers correspondingly.

I am strongly of opinion that the passing of sentence in serious cases should not rest with the Judge. The Court which tries the offender should be concerned only with the offence, if any, that he has committed. Judges as a rule know nothing whatever of the actual meaning of the sentences they pass. They do not know what penal servitude really means, nor solitary imprisonment. They have not watched men under penal treatment and noted the result. They are specialists in law and not in penal treatment. When they pass sentences they are like men prescribing medicines of the effect of which they have no knowledge, for an occasional visit to a gaol teaches nothing.

When a man is convicted of a serious crime he should then be sent to a Penal Board, who should make a full inquiry into the man's past and a complete diagnosis of how he came to commit the offence. When this is done they can direct

what remedial treatment is necessary and its approximate length ; also what is to be done with him when his sentence is finished so that he will not fall back into crime.

When the village communities are re-established every discharged prisoner will be returned to his community, and it will for its own sake see that he be helped to re-establish himself. But by that time crime will have ceased, for those who cause it will no longer be allowed to do so.

CHAPTER X

JUSTICE

LET me tell a few stories about Civil Law before entering into a more detailed explanation.

(1) A friend of mine has a business which deals mainly with a foreign country, and he, as agent of his firm, had lived in that foreign country for years. Then he came home as Managing Director, and had a difference with another English firm over a matter of business. He did not tell me what the matter was, but he said: "In that foreign country this dispute could not have arisen, because every merchant has the Commercial Code beside him and knows exactly if what he does is legal or not. In England no merchant knows or can know the law, for even lawyers do not know it. As regards this particular point my lawyers tell me I ought to win,

but they cannot guarantee it, as the Rulings are opposed. I must, however, bring the action, as I want the point decided."

* * * * *

(2) This case is of another friend of mine. He sued a well-known man for damages, and the jury gave him £3,000. So far well. But he was then informed through his lawyers that unless he would accept £1,500 his opponent would appeal. He was therefore in this position: He had got a decree for £3,000, but of what use was it to him? An appeal is a very expensive business, and all his funds were exhausted fighting the case in the original Court. He had no funds to go on with and brief Counsel for the Appeal. True, he might let the case go up without Counsel, but if he did so he would in all probability lose it. You can't win a duel without a champion. Even if he could get Counsel, it would not be an eminent Counsel, as he could not afford the price. Even if he won the Appeal, he would have to pay solicitors and other costs. He might lose, as no one knows what an Appeal Court will do.

On the other hand, if he accepted the £1,500 it would not do much more than pay the expenses to date, and he would have had all his trouble for

nothing and get no compensation. Still, as this was the least evil, he accepted it. The result, therefore, of his legal proceedings was that he was put to great trouble and gained nothing. True, his opponent lost, but the only winners were the lawyers.

* * * * *

(3) This is an experience of my own. I had a difference of opinion with another person as to a literary matter. The facts were undisputed, and all that had to be decided was whether what he had done constituted a contract or not. I said it did ; he said it did not.

Now I know that according to the Code of other countries what he had done would have constituted a contract, but England has no Code I could consult. I therefore inquired of my lawyers what the law was on the subject, and I got an answer to the following effect :

" We have been unable to find that the exact point raised by you has been decided. There are certain Rulings which seem to support your view and others which do not. It is therefore impossible to say what the law is. If you bring an action, even supposing you are right, as in equity we think you are, you must be prepared to

fight it through the Appeal Courts, as your opponent is rich and will probably appeal if he loses. This will cost you, say, £2,000. If you finally win you will get some of this back, if not you may have to pay your opponent's costs in addition. We do not advise any action." I took their advice, naturally. What else could I do ?

* * * * *

Now if you will consider these cases, which are not exceptions but the rule, you will make certain discoveries ; that the law is in such a confused state that even lawyers do not know it, that it is enormously expensive, and that consequently the poor man has no chance. The reason for this is as follows :

In my chapter on the land I have already referred to the way in which Law has been made in England, but it will be convenient to explain the matter here more fully. Law in England, then, consists of two parts, Common Law and Statute Law, which are not, however, separate but are inextricably mixed. Common Law is simply Judge-made law, that is to say, it is the idea of Judges as to what they think law ought to be. Statute Law is composed of Acts of Parliament. There is no system about either, no

common principles governing either. The Judges have been quite free to lay down any rule in any particular case without reference to anything else, and Statute Law is still in the same fragmentary state. Statutes over-ride Statutes and Rulings over-ride Rulings, till a condition of chaos is arrived at of which you may form some dim idea from the fact that whereas more intelligent nations which have modified their law can compress it all into a few hundred pages, a thousand volumes would not contain our English law.

A Statute six hundred years old was quoted in a recent trial as the law on the subject. The result naturally is that no one can be certain of the law, even in quite simple cases ; the lawyers do not know it, the Judges do not know it. The matter has to be thrashed out at each trial, Ruling opposed to Ruling, and if no Ruling can be found to exactly cover the facts, which is often the case, for the conditions are always changing, then the Judge must make new law to apply. This new law may not be in accordance with the ideas of the Appeal Court, and the House of Lords may again differ. The decision is therefore often pure chance, in no case is it in accordance with any duly considered system, for no such system exists. In no case can the Judge take right and justice

as his first guide, because law cases are decided by law and not by justice, and you can imagine how much light there is in such a chaos.

It is not even as if these innumerable Rulings by Courts which constitute Common Law and these innumerable Acts which constitute Statute Law were in themselves good and reasonable, so that when you could discover the law on any point you found justice and reasonableness.

Lawyers, as I have said—and all Judges have been barristers first—are not acquainted either with human nature nor with the give and take of ordinary life. They have been trained from the beginning in a legal atmosphere which is very different from the fresh air of life. Their object as barristers has been to win cases, and cases are won by legal subtleties, by avoiding awkward questions, by badgering witnesses, by giving a wrong colour to events and to words, and sometimes by the production of evidence which they must themselves suspect to be untrue. For it must never be forgotten that the code of conduct of a lawyer acting professionally is not governed by the same ideas as those of a straightforward man in private life. The lower class will not hesitate to use evidence that they must know has been manufactured, and even lawyers of high

reputation will not hesitate to do and say things which as private individuals they would not do or say. They are protected in that they act "under instructions." They themselves are responsible in no way for the truth of statements they bring forward. They are paid to win the case and their professional future depends on their success. Of course, to bring forward evidence that is *manifestly* false, or to do acts that are *manifestly* wrong, would endanger their success, so they avoid these, but even so there is a considerable borderland.

It must not be supposed that I am in any way suggesting that lawyers are blameworthy in this matter. I do not think they are. The blame lies with the system of law and procedure, and I do not see how they could act differently. A lawyer who was so honest that he would professionally neither speak nor act differently from what he would do privately, nor produce evidence that he had not satisfied himself was true, simply couldn't live.

Every lawyer, like every other man, would greatly prefer to be able always to act honestly, frankly and straightforwardly, but what can you do with a system like this? The blame lies with the State that has established such a system and

with the people generally who allow it to continue—that is to say, with you and me. You cannot expect lawyers to reform the law. No individual and no profession ever does or ever can reform itself. The reasons for this I give in the next chapter, and here I can only give the fact. They cannot see themselves as others see them. They are brought up to the profession, to make their livelihood in and by the profession, and not to criticize it. Criticism and reformation must come from without, from the community. So you see successful lawyers wishing to reform other things, say education, but rarely the legal profession, by which they have succeeded. You cannot expect them to admit that the profession in which they have achieved success is one they ought to be ashamed of. The responsibility for its badness rests on you.

The perjury in the Courts is amazing. Partly this is due to our education, which, as you will see later, is not calculated to ensure accuracy and truthfulness, and partly to the fact that a trial, whether a Criminal or Civil trial, is not an inquiry by an impartial authority into the whole facts of the case, but is a duel between the parties. All is fair in love and war, and a trial, though certainly not love, is essentially war. Each side

knows that the other is out to win by any means, so why should he be more scrupulous? The witnesses are not persons called by Justice to enlighten her, but are partisans called by one side or the other to help in winning the case. Even cross-examination is no safeguard. In fact, cross-examination often enough does more harm than good. In discrediting a witness it may discredit not merely what he has said that is not true, but what he has said that is true. To get the whole truth and nothing but the truth out of a witness he must be first of all trained to tell the truth, and secondly, he must not be called as an ally of either party, but by Justice as a friend of Justice. The whole atmosphere of Courts is one of fraud and chicane, and it is in this atmosphere that lawyers live.

And the barrister when made Judge does not get away from this. His mind is full of maxims of law, some right, some wrong, of Rulings and such-like, and he has no personal experience of other matters. He has therefore as a rule none of that common sense, that sense of community and relativeness, that is necessary in order to see events in their true light. He comes always from one class, and of other classes he has no knowledge and with them he has no sympathy. These

are not the right men to make the law ; they have made all the Common Law of England.

And the Statute Law is not any better. Mainly it also has been made by lawyers, and in bits, so that a principle accepted in one Act is denied in another.

The result is, as I have said, that even on very simple points the law is not known to lawyers themselves, much less to the general public. It therefore happens that even when people are acting in good faith they may differ about a matter and there is no way of deciding it except a lawsuit, a very expensive and haphazard way of acting. Thus differences occur which under a clear and simple Code could not arise.

Further, this excessive obscurity of the law requires that every litigant pay two lawyers—one a solicitor and one a barrister—to get up his case. The solicitor ascertains the facts and the evidence, and the barrister supplies the Rulings and other law and conducts the case in Court. The barrister, therefore, is only acquainted with the case at second hand, has no real knowledge of his client and therefore of the real circumstances and the main governing facts, and he wastes time in trivialities. Read, for instance, how he jumps up and objects to this question and to that, as if,

in nine cases out of ten it made any real difference whether the question was asked or not. But then he is out to win on points, and not by a knock-out of simple verity. The weary hours I have passed listening to barristers talking irrelevance and details because they had never cared to ascertain or wanted to distract attention from the one or two really vital points on which the case rested.

This, too, contributes to the extraordinary costliness of law in England, and its uncertainty. Why do certain barristers get enormous fees while others will not get a tenth? The only answer is that the big retainer men will win cases that others would lose. But does this fact show that justice is administered? Does it not rather show that the result depends more on your Counsel than on the justice of your case? And your Counsel depends on your pocket.

But if it be admitted that the result of lawsuits depends to such a great extent on money it is only another way of saying that law is bought and sold. Our Judges are, of course, incorruptible, but the system that lends itself to such results is not an honest system. The poor man is out of Court. He cannot obtain law, much less justice, because he cannot pay for it.

What still further contributes to the costliness of law is the extraordinarily high payments made by the State to the law officers of the Crown and to Judges. The Prime Minister gets £5,000 a year and no pension unless he can show that he is in need of it, and then only £1,200 a year, but the Lord Chancellor gets £10,000 a year and a pension of £5,000 a year. There are now four Lord Chancellors' pensions being paid. The Attorney- and Solicitor-General divide nearly £30,000 a year between them. All the Judges are paid very highly. Why is this? Other countries do not pay on this scale, but then they have reasonable systems. The whole judicial system of this country is run as an *édition de luxe* and suitors pay for it—suitors who can afford the luxury of law proceedings, be it understood, for others have no standing.

"Every door has golden locks and opens but to golden keys."

* * * * *

I do not know that I need say any more about our present legal system. I have said nothing about our

Poor Laws,
Lunacy Laws,

Companies Act,
Statute of Frauds,
Workmen's Compensation Act,
The Chancery Court,
The Great Unpaid,

and a great many other matters, but it is unnecessary. I hate criticism, and if I could I would never either think or write unpleasant things. But what am I to do? To have a great and happy England we must have a true system of justice, and to have a new system we must destroy the old first. But unless it be clearly shown how bad the present system is where will come the motive for replacing it? Lawyers will not reform it and the public at present seems content to be ignorant. It is the public alone who can insist on reform.

Well, let us take it that in a new England the people will so insist, and let us see what should be done.

In the first place the present law and procedure of all kinds should be condemned. It cannot be amended, it must be done away with as soon as a new system is ready to replace it.

This new system should be drawn up in the new Ministry of Justice, and the first step is to fix

your leading principles and see that they are adhered to throughout.

Some of these principles I have already mentioned; they are that all law and procedure should be founded on a knowledge of human nature and not of abstract ideas, and that it must not only consider a man's duty to the State, but the duty of the State to the individual. Further that the interests of the community come first, above all private rights. For instance, to ruin a working man by imprisoning him because he cannot pay a fine is to do grave injury to the community. That is never thought of now.

Law should be simple and simply expressed—it can easily be made so. It is only a fad of lawyers to say that legal affairs can only be expressed in "legal language." Legal affairs are human affairs—at least they will be so hereafter—and require no special dialect.

It should especially be kept in mind that, as the first object of free and simple divorce laws is not to encourage divorce but to render it unnecessary, so the first object of written criminal and civil laws is not to encourage litigation, nor even to make it simple, but to prevent it. If the law were clear and if everyone were made to know the law as a part of their education a very long

step would have been taken to prevent any need for litigation. The whole law should be codified, and manuals should be issued which should give first the main principles on which the Code is framed and then its provisions. There would be many such manuals, among others a Marriage manual and a manual of Evidence. How many men or women now know the laws they subject themselves to on marriage? Practically none, I should say, or marriage would greatly decrease.

How many people know what is evidence and what is not? To most people the fact that they have been told anything and have believed it is justification for swearing that it is true. But what you have been told and what you believe are not evidence of anything, except, perhaps, your gullibility. To swear to the truth of a matter of which you personally know nothing is perjury, which is a criminal offence. For "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" about the matter is that you personally know nothing about it. How many affidavits would stand this test?

And even if not committed in Court and therefore not a criminal offence, it is a wrong thing to do. Yet how common it is and with what complacency it is regarded, and what would

became of the scandals that permeate society if it were stopped? And I may say that if the reader would reply that if this be so I have no right to ask him to accept all the statements made in this book as to the working of English law until he has personally investigated the subject for himself, my answer is that this is exactly what I want him to do. Let him take the matter in hand himself and study it for years, as I have done in Courts and in gaols, in books and in flesh and blood, and then he will *know* whether I am right or wrong. And until then I have the right at least to demand that he will not persuade himself that what I say is not true simply because he knows nothing about it. He ought to know. The trouble is that people will not study life, but are afraid of it and prefer to accept any authority that will save them the trouble of doing their own seeing and thinking and especially of doing anything.

Then take the further legal maxim, a true maxim, that nothing is done in good faith that is done without due care and attention; what if this were generally known and acted on? To "mean well" is nothing, a certain place is paved with such good intentions, it does not constitute "good faith." Nothing is done in good faith

unless you have carefully verified all the facts on which you act and done your best to see the result that will come of your actions.

The issue of such simple manuals of laws that were founded on truth and justice, and the making them a part of education for both sexes, would do more than prevent litigation, it would cleanse society.

Legal procedure should be prompt, brief and cheap.

No advantage should be given to any class.

Money should not be able to affect the issue.

Trials should not be duels but inquiries into the facts.

Accused people should be encouraged and helped to confess.

Witnesses should be encouraged and helped to speak the truth.

Affidavits should be abolished.

A system of arbitration or conciliation for small differences should be established, so as to prevent them coming into Court at all. Such a system exists elsewhere.

And in this matter, as in all others, an annual report should be made to the new House of Commons of the working of the laws with suggestions for improvements.

In our new England there will be little crime. Our gaols will be empty and our reformatories turned into schools. Our Courts will be no places for exhibition of forensic ability, nor fireworks of any kind. There will be no rush to hear A cross-examine a witness, nor B sum up for the defence. They will be places of quiet and serious and earnest work—and they will be rarely used. I do not think lawyers of either branch will be much in evidence then. They will take their great abilities to other fields. The Temple will probably become a museum of legal antiquities like Madame Tussaud's and Lincoln's Inn will disappear. There will be no Lord Chancellor, and the many millions a year that are now spent on law will go to better things.

CHAPTER XI

THE SOVEREIGN HOUSE

BUT as it will have been observed, every reform, every hope for a new and free and happy England, depends primarily on the Government. Everything is now wrong, and it is wrong owing to the acts and defaults of our Governments for hundreds of years. Matters will not right themselves, they will only go from worse to worse. They must be righted, and only a Government proceeding from the people, inspired with its ideas and backed by its strength, responsible for its acts to the people, can carry out the reform required, and so far neither we nor any other country has had such a Government.

The epitaph of the House of Lords has been written, and when the history of the House of Commons comes to be written, I doubt if it will have any better showing. It has never represented the people nor acted as if it did so. I

would suggest to the reader to read the proceedings in the House of Commons about the Plimsoll Bill if they want some enlightening knowledge. But as I have said, the House of Commons has not and never had any personality of its own. It has been ruled by cliques of members who were the nominees of one secret society or the other. It is so now. Nothing can be expected from such an assembly, and to have a new England we must have a new House of Commons.

How, then, can we obtain a House of Commons that is truly representative of the people, and what would it be like ?

Let me first make clear certain traits of human nature in this regard, because only by understanding our material can we so use it as to obtain true results. There are certain qualities inherent in human nature that must be thoroughly appreciated before we can make any plan.

In the first place, it must never be forgotten that it is an essential quality in humanity that no man and no body of men, no class, nor clique, nor profession, can be trusted to manage the business of other people without constant supervision and control. You have only to consider your own personal affairs to see the truth of this.

Would you give any lawyer, no matter how able, irresponsible control of your business; any doctor complete control of your health; any schoolmaster complete control of the education of your children; any grocer power to send you groceries at his will, not yours; any tailor authority to supply you with clothes? No man would do anything so foolish. The lawyer would ruin you, the doctor make you into a chronic invalid, the schoolmaster bring up your sons as pedants, the grocer would give you what he could not sell to anyone else, and the tailor would dress you in misfits.

Further, no honourable man would accept from you any such unlimited responsibility. He would recognize perfectly that no two men are the same either in constitution or circumstances, and that, consequently, he could not always know of his own initiative what would be good for you. Quinine is good for some people, it poisons others, and the same is true about other medicines. Moreover, health, though a great thing, is not everything. From a health point of view you may require a rest, but you are engaged on most important work, and to rest now would ruin your whole career; the doctor does not know this; you do. He would know

his own limitations. And more, he would be afraid for himself. He would not like to submit himself to the strong temptation to subordinate your interests which he could not know to his own which he did know. He will give you information and advice, and he will help you to carry out your decision, but the responsibility of the decision must be yours. You know, and you alone can know, what you want, and you alone bear the consequences. No honest men accept such responsibilities, and when a man demands of you unlimited confidence you know he is a rogue. The confidence trick is a trick, and takes in only fools.

Thus, trust no one implicitly, or you will suffer from it, for no one is fit for such confidence and you are certain to rue it.

This untrustworthiness is an inherent quality in all mankind, and it is not a bad trait, nor a weakness, nor something to mourn over and abuse the Creator about, but it is one of the most valuable traits in humanity. Unless men were so made, no individuals and no community would be free nor intelligent nor progressive. A complete slavery would envelope mankind and life would cease.

For suppose it were otherwise, what would

be the result? Life for each of us would be divided into a series of compartments, in each of which we would simply have to obey blindly, while the different authorities fought over our helpless carcase for more completed empire. Having destroyed us, they would destroy each other and the world would end.

But what is true of individuals is as true of bodies of men, of classes, cliques, parties and professions. It is even more true, because whereas the individual man does retain his humanity and his honour, and will not accept unlimited responsibility, associations of men are different. It is an old saying and a true saying that Corporations have neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be saved. The sense of personal responsibility disappears and a class, a profession and a Government will as a whole do things that every individual in that class would be ashamed to do. Thus whereas a priest, a politician, a lawyer and a doctor will, as an individual, avoid responsibility, knowing he is unfit for it, Churches, Governments, and professions are always struggling for unlimited power, and resenting all criticism of their "mysteries" and all control of their acts. The public is to pay the piper, but they are to call

the tune. This, too, is human nature, because a man's first duty is to his profession, and unless he put it first he will not do good work. He must take his profession very seriously. But the rest of mankind must prevent this *amour-propre* so necessary to progress from becoming swelled head, not only for its own sake, but for the sake of the profession too. Life is one, and we are all dependent on the rest, on the common sense of all, for guidance and control.

Thus the community must never surrender itself to any power even for a short time, but must keep a control over all, a control that is never relaxed. That is the first point.

The second point seems at first sight to be the very reverse of this, and instead of discussing it from an abstract point of view, I will take two examples of what is called the Referendum, because they illustrate exactly what I want to say. And I will add that I have chosen these examples because they are both matters on which I have no opinion at all. I don't know which side is right, for or against.

There was a Referendum not very long ago in Switzerland as to whether absinthe should be prohibited or not, and there is a Referendum, as I write, in Australia on the subject of com-

pulsion for military service. Let us consider them.

Now, to form a sound and true judgment as to whether absinthe should be prohibited, a great deal of information is required. You want to know, amongst other things, whether much absinthe is drunk or not, that is to say, whether it is an important question or not; what the effect is on temperate drinkers, and on intemperate drinkers; its good points and bad; could a prohibition be enforced without encouraging illicit consumption; whether absinthe drinkers would not then become spirit drinkers, and consequently make the prohibition useless; and the money losses involved.

Further, you have to consider that as every legal restriction is a bad thing in itself, whether the advantage to be obtained would be great enough to overbalance this disadvantage, and the nature of the measures to be taken.

To be able also to rightly weigh all this, you must have a mind accustomed to considering such matters.

How many in Switzerland who voted at the Referendum had, or could have, all these qualifications? Not, perhaps, one in ten thousand. A man voted for prohibition because he didn't

like absinthe, or because a friend of his drank too much, or because he was a total abstainer, or to please his wife, who knew a friend who had told her of another friend whose husband quarrelled with her, and she could conceive no other reason than that he drank absinthe; or he votes against prohibition because he likes absinthe, or he likes freedom, or he has a personal dislike to an advocate of prohibition. Of what value is such a Referendum?

It is the same with compulsion in Australia. To truly view the matter, you must know the interest of Australia in the war; the needs of the war; how much Australia can spare for those needs; the effect on agriculture and trade, and many other complicated matters. But how much can the mass of voters know of such intricate questions? They vote "Yes" or "No" from reasons they know, not from reasons they don't know. That is human nature, and very sound human nature, too. A, whose son has gone, votes for it because he doesn't see why B's son shouldn't go. B votes against it because he wants to keep his son or is a Conscientious Objector, and prefers other people to fight and die for him. One woman votes for it because her lover has gone, and why shouldn't her rival's

lover go? Or they follow what a favourite politician tells them. Is that a way to get a sound decision? It seems to me the very negation of sense—like our elections to the House of Commons and the American election to the Presidency.

"And so," the reader will be saying to himself, "this writer first proves that the people must control all Departments of State, and then proves that the people cannot do so. What is he going to do now? Between these two contradictions, where will he find a right way? Human nature is hopeless and I always thought so."

Well, I am going to show you that there is no contradiction between the two propositions. They are not opposed but are complementary, and are two of the chief foundation stones for any true system of representation. For if you could trust classes, no representation would be necessary, because you would have a professional class of politicians to do all your work correctly without supervision and you would be a slave; and if the people could know what to do, you would equally need no representation because the people could, by a system of frequent Referenda, send direct orders to the Departments.

It is because both propositions are equally true that a system of representation is necessary.

What then is representation, on what ideas does it rest ?

Take your own private affairs. If you want anyone to act for you in any general matter that you cannot attend to yourself, whom do you select ? Do you choose a total stranger or some one who comes round advertising himself as an agent ? Not in the least. You choose, if you can find him, someone you know, someone you can trust, someone who knows you and what your needs and circumstances are, someone whose interests are as much like yours as possible. You choose the wisest and most understanding of your friends. You then give him general, not detailed, instructions as to what you want, and leave him to choose the time, and methods and to consult his own specialists, lawyers, architects, contractors, or so on, to carry out your wishes. You can trust him so far, firstly, because you have known him in the past, and secondly, because he lives near you in the same community, and if he betrays you in any way, he will not care to face you and the community again. That is the only way you can get a representative you can trust. He

must be your neighbour. That is as true for Parliamentary work as any other. None other than a long resident in the constituency can represent it—can be trusted to represent it. That is the first idea of any true representation.

The second idea is as obvious. This choosing of a representative is a private matter between you and him. It is nobody else's business at all. If a secret society in London tried to force anyone on you, the impertinence would, I am sure, be resented.

The third idea is that you would expect your representative to observe his instructions, to report from time to time, and if he found he could not do what you wanted, to come to some explanation and agreement with you. You would expect him to give you information and advice so as to be able to amend your instructions if necessary. But the final decision would rest with you, and in case no agreement was possible he would, of course, resign, or you would withdraw his powers. You would not give him carte blanche for five years or even five months to act exactly as he liked. If he suggested such a thing you would doubt his honesty, and rightly so. And if he said that his loyalty was due not to you, but to some

secret society, you would, I am sure, have done with him at once.

These are the only foundation on which representation is possible. They are as true of representation in Parliament as elsewhere.

And finally, what are the ideas that should govern a Representative House ?

In the first place, it should have a continuing personality of its own. It should owe allegiance to itself, to its reputation and to its past. It should also consider its future. It should not be a Party slave, voting because it is told, and then at a General Election suddenly turning its coat. It should have a sense of *its own* responsibility. It should not do things it may be ashamed of. No Member should owe allegiance to any except in the first place to those he represents, and secondly, or equally, to the House itself. There should be a sense of honour in the whole House as an unit that it represents the country and nothing else. Voluntary associations to achieve certain matters there will be, of course, but that a Member should have surrendered his liberty to any other control should be accounted an improper thing. Any organizations and funds used for controlling Members should be declared penal. And the

House should not be a mere debating and voting society. It should itself appoint Ministers to be its executive, and give them general instructions as to the ends to be achieved, leaving them to find methods and agents. It should require a yearly account from each Minister of his ministry, showing how far he had succeeded in carrying out the orders of the House. It should trust no one implicitly, for no one is fit to be so trusted. It should strictly enforce the personal responsibility of each Minister to the House, and to the House alone.

There would be no "Government" in the present sense of the term, because the House would be the sole governing power and it would allow no rival nor competitor. There would be no Prime Minister and no Cabinet. The House could, of course, appoint Standing Committees, but no other power could do so. There would be no other power, whether Party or Privy Council or House of Lords. With a properly elected and constituted House of Commons I can see no use in a Second Chamber, however constituted. With a House like we have now, that has as a whole no sense of responsibility, and which may swing from extreme to extreme every General Election, a Second Chamber might

have great use, as it would delay hasty legislation. With the new House there would be no hasty legislation and no sudden changes. It would have a sense of responsibility both to itself and to the country. And if necessary the country could exercise the check by cancelling its mandates to the Members.

There would be no General Elections except by the will of the country, but a certain proportion of Members would retire each year, and could, of course, be re-elected.

It would be worth while to belong to such a Sovereign House. A Member would not be a marionette, pulled by strings held by a secret camarilla, but a dignified representative of a free community, expressing its views, because agreeing with those views. Politics are now, by the admission of politicians themselves, a "dirty business," they will not be so then. And instead of the rhetoric we have now we should have that far higher and more difficult art which consists in presenting the whole truth and nothing but the truth with a due proportion between all the parts, in simple, clear and brief language. No one would then be afraid of the truth, and wrap it in a haze of words, or in appeals to the emotions. A debate would not take much time, but it would

be worth hearing, and the electors would find it worth reading. Such debates would raise the general standard of knowledge and truth and taste throughout the country. No one supposes that parliamentary debates do that now.

And the House would not need to sit for more than a small portion of the year. Its business would be far less than that of the present House. Local matters would be managed by the Village and County Councils, Scotch matters by the Scotch House, Welsh matters by the Welsh House and Irish matters by the Irish House. For Imperial matters, which probably would only include foreign policy, India, the Colonies and the armies and navies to be kept up by each country, there would be a special House made up of delegations from the Houses of Commons in each country. This House would be constituted like the English House and governed by the same ideas. Its work would be small and should steadily decrease, till at length it would not be necessary. A true union of interests would require no such bond.

* * * * *

If these truths are borne in mind the actual details as to how elections are held are not so

important, as they relate to methods rather than to ends. It is probable that these details may vary from time to time, and experience alone can show which method is best at any given time. Personally I think that the only elections in which the people vote should be the elections to the Village Council and that from this Council all the rest should proceed. The Village Council should have a third of its members elected every year. Every man should have a vote. When the sex laws are corrected and we have true marriages of confidence and affection women will not want votes. The vote her husband gives will be for the wife as well, and be settled between themselves in that spirit of mutual understanding which alone constitutes true marriage. When a man and woman are united in a true marriage, to give each a vote would simply be to double the work of voting without affecting the result, as they would vote the same way. Where true marriage does not exist it should cease. And, in that case, to give each a vote would only accentuate differences. Women can exercise more influence by not voting than by voting, for if it came to a sex war, and some time or other it would so come, the men would win, if not by votes, then by force. In the end no majority of men would allow themselves

to be over-ruled by women in those vital matters of government which men understand better than women. The power women can wield through men is great, the power they can wield when attacking and defying men is small, and the result in the long run never in doubt. Intelligent women know this well, and in our new England all women will be intelligent.

It is this Council that should appoint one of its members to meet delegates from the other villages in the constituency and choose a Member of Parliament.

The objection usually made now to any connection between municipal and political affairs, that party politics should not enter into local affairs—a very sound objection—will not obtain then, as there will be no Party politics. On the other hand, there is this reason for it, that municipal affairs are not distinct from political affairs, but are dependent on them. Unless, for instance, the House of Parliament maintain the freedom of the villages intact, the village affairs cannot prosper. There is too intimate a connection between the village community and the nation to enable their affairs to be separated.

An alternative would be for each village to elect a delegate to the constituency electoral

meeting who would choose the Member. That Member will, of course, be an old resident in the constituency, none other would be eligible. Cleverness is not the first quality of a Member, it is understanding of the people as a whole. Professional politicians would have no standing, and foreigners or the sons of foreigners would also be ineligible. You do not want a Polish Jew, for instance, returned for an English constituency, as recently occurred. He is, no doubt, an admirable representative of the secret Party cliques who selected him and ordered his election, but he is hardly the sort of person an English Sovereign House will need, or a free English constituency elect.

* * * * *

There remains the question of what instructions a village community would give to its electoral Councillor, and what instructions the electoral Council would give to its Member. I pass by matters of only local interest and mean in national matters.

Well, in speaking of the Referendum I have mentioned two questions which belong to a category that never ought to be put. The question

of absinthe is not a matter of principle, but of detail. The principle which Members would be instructed to observe would be that, while no rigid restrictions should be placed on the sale and consumption of good and wholesome stimulating drinks, any drink shown to be deleterious, like absinthe in Switzerland, or heavily hopped beers here, should be discouraged or stopped. This while safeguarding the principle would give the Member discretion in those matters he could study far better than the ordinary voter.

Again, the real question for the Australian public to decide was not whether compulsion should be enforced, because that is not an objective, but a method.

What the people should and could decide is whether they were determined to win the war, even if the winning meant that compulsion must be accepted. The question of whether events had become so grave that compulsion must be resorted to is one for their House of Commons. The Members of that House could obtain material for a sound judgment on this point—the people cannot.

Generally speaking, therefore, the relationship of the general voter to the Member should be that of a passenger to a taxi-driver. The passenger

names the destination and leaves it to the driver to get there or as near there as possible. He does not hire an expert driver and do the driving himself. But neither does he allow the driver to take him to a tea-shop when he wants a restaurant, or deposit him at the City Temple instead of the theatre. Nor would he submit to be taken from the City to South Kensington by way of Highgate, though if there were a block in the Strand the driver would be right in making a detour. The people declare the ends to be obtained, and the Members find the means.

As to these general objectives, some are obvious enough and are set out in this book. England must belong to the English, the village autonomy must be restored, privileged classes must be abolished, the inns and amusements must be revived, there must be equal justice for all, rich or poor, the money of the country must not be congested in London, and many others.

A true and careful and universal system of education will do the rest.

* * * * *

And meanwhile—until we get our village communities, what can be done ? Well, a good deal

could be done whenever we get anyone to do it. Those secret camarillas called Parties, with their secret funds, could be proscribed, the interference of any outsiders in elections rendered impossible, the election of strangers or foreigners forbidden. The attempt of ecclesiastics of any kind to influence elections or electors should be made an offence, and any organized fanaticisms would, of course, not be allowed to interfere.

On the other hand, secret balloting would not be necessary, and free Englishmen would repudiate such a method. There is no greater exposure of the absurdity of talking of England being a free country than this same Secret Ballot Act. It was passed to enable, as was supposed, the "free" English voter to give his vote without suffering for it afterwards, if it happened to be cast against authority. That is a confession of the way authority acts, and always will act as long as the country allows such authorities to exist. For the secret ballot is, as everybody knows, no secret. It is always known how anyone has voted. In our new England a man's opinions, like himself, will be free, and he will not seek nor submit to any concealment. He will be proud of them, and they will do him honour.

And so the way would slowly be opened to a revival of the sense of community and the rebirth of that intelligence which is the sole foundation of all good things.

CHAPTER XII

THE INWARD LIGHT

SUCH is a sketch in outline of the institutions that a free and regenerated England will make wherein to express itself. But it must be remembered that institutions in themselves can effect little or nothing. They are methods, not causes. You may have the best institutions possible, but if the soul within you be enslaved you cannot be free. It is your mind that must be free, your thoughts, your ideas, your desires, must be true. Otherwise you will misuse your institutions and before long you will destroy them. Having thrown off the old chains you will make for yourself new chains as heavy as the old. That the nation be free the individual must be free, he must know what freedom is and how to attain and help it. Now freedom is not the absence of restrictions, for the savage alone in the woods has no restrictions, and yet the savage is

the least free of men. He is free in a sense, yes, but free to do what ? Only to live a miserable life from hand to mouth and die quickly. Power over the material world and the satisfaction of all our emotions comes from belonging to a community, and belonging to a community brings with it duties as well as pleasures. Your community is your greater self, and you must learn to recognize this and to act in accordance.

This is a matter of education.

The word "education," is, however, usually used in a different sense, and as this matter is the most important of all, it is necessary to define exactly what I mean.

To the success of any workman, and we are all artisans to some extent of our lives and those about us, two things are necessary, technical ability and knowledge how best to use that technical skill. For it will at once be admitted that technical ability directed in the wrong direction is worse than worthless, it is dangerous. To be *clever* in doing things that were better undone, that while giving you some temporary advantage does so at the expense of the community, and therefore in the long run of yourself, is disastrous. On the other hand, to be *wise* in knowing what ought to be done and yet so unskilled as not to

know how to accomplish them is not much better. You must be both.

Now education as at present understood, applies only to the method and not to the objective. It is concerned with means, not ends. Reading, writing and arithmetic, and all technical knowledge, are not good in themselves, apart from the way they are used. They may even be harmful, as when, for instance, people spend their time reading light literature instead of studying life. They are only good when applied to good ends, and the same is true of all acquirements. To put weapons into a man's hand and not instruct him for what purposes to use them is not likely to result in profit to anyone. That is what education by itself does. And I may say at once that I am not concerned here with education. It is an important matter, but not of the first importance. It is a technical subject of great complexity.

That does not mean that I think the present system is good. I received a public school education, whereby I was taught a smattering of Greek and Latin, but nothing of my own language—to say nothing of modern foreign languages. Ever since I have been trying to remedy these and other defects, but youth is the time to learn,

and if that golden seed-time be put to useless purposes it can never be made good. Yet what a different literature and what different newspapers we should have if English were taught, not only the grammar, but the correct choice of words. And there is history. However, I am not going to say anything here about it, for I am concerned not with cleverness, but with wisdom. What is wisdom, and how can it be acquired ?

It will be said at once that what I really mean when I speak of wisdom is character, and that as the latter word exists and is understood I would do better to use it than to speak of wisdom. "Why use strange expressions when common expressions are at hand ? It only creates confusion."

It is to prevent confusion that I do not use the word character, as it does not at all describe what I mean. It does describe what children are taught now, but as I think that they are wrongly taught I cannot adopt the word.

For what does character mean ?

It has two meanings, one of natural things and one of artificial things, and they are as follows :

The first use of the word is to denote a man's temperament, as, for instance, that he is hot-tempered, or cold-blooded, or genial, or modest,

or original, or humorous. Such qualities are inherent in your physique and can never be changed. They can be controlled or cultivated, but not acquired nor dropped. They are not qualities of the intelligence, and consequently I am not concerned with them.

The second use of the word is to denote a mental attitude towards life, the result of training. A man of "high character" is a man of "high principles." And what are principles ?

Principles are fixed lines of thought and conduct ; everything that lies on these fixed lines is good, everything else is bad. Thus the world and all things in it, including all conduct, is divided into two categories, one of which is good and one is bad. All recognition of the truth that nothing absolute exists or can exist, that all things, including acts, are good or bad, not from reference to some imaginary standard, but relatively to the surroundings and the results, is prohibited. The man of principle has reduced himself to the level of the locomotive that runs on rails laid down for it. On the line of rails all is good, off the rails all is bad. There is no necessity to observe or to think about any matter, you have your rails, run on them. If they lead you and others to misfortune, that is not your fault nor

the fault of the rails, but is purely and simply the fault of human nature, which is bad because the Creator made it so. That is, I think, what character amounts to. It is a negation of humanity and of the necessity for the constant use of the intelligence to enable it to decide not only how to achieve results, but what results can be achieved. Torquemada was a man of most unswerving principle. He was absolutely sure of what was right and what was wrong; he was sure he ought to destroy the wrong—and he destroyed Spain. There is no one so dangerous as your man of principle—because he does evil and is not ashamed of it—he justifies it. No! my idea of wisdom is not fixed principles at all.

And then the supporters of character will turn on me and say, "But the man who has no principles is 'unprincipled.' A man must have guides in life. He must not be a slave to his emotions, nor to the exigencies of the moment. Yet if you deprive him of his principles there is nothing left."

To which I reply that the man himself is left. In removing these artificial principles you have not hurt the man, but freed him. He has his senses and his intelligence, and they only, if properly trained, are trustworthy guides.

* * * * *

In the new England of our hopes one of the first things a child is taught when it is old enough to understand will be history.

But it will not be the history of a savage Eastern tribe who lived two thousand years ago, and who of all people of whom we have any records had the least knowledge of wherein patriotism consists and who were absolutely without the instinct of truth, or that sense of community which is the only base for conduct.

Nor will it be the histories of Athens, nor of early Rome, although from them we learn much. Nor will it even be the history of England, of its Kings and Queens, its wars and revolutions. It will be the history of the village in which he is born or lives.

For when a settlement is made of the land there will at the same time be written a history of every village. It will begin with the nature of the soil and it will be brought from the earliest times down till to-day, showing how it has progressed or gone back, and why, and giving as far as possible all the chief events in its long history.

It will be the most fascinating story in the world. As appendix to that history there will be a Golden Roll of every man or woman born in

that village who has brought honour to it by his life, soldiers and sailors who have served in wars, statesmen, administrators, inventors, merchants, writers, musicians, singers; of every one the village is proud to have produced. And to gain admittance to this Roll merely to have succeeded in making money or fame, or acquiring honours, shall be nothing; especially to have given or left money to charity shall not count. It shall be services, or example, to village, county, or country, that shall count, and that only. And the services shall be stated. This history shall be the first book that every child knows, and to be hereafter written on that Roll shall be the ambition of every child as it grows up. *Forsitan et nomen nostrum miscebitur istis* will be in their hearts as an incentive to honourable and intelligent work all their days.

At present no such histories exist, and although the material does to a certain extent exist it is scattered and hard to find. But when village patriotism is re-awakened there will be many willing hands and brains to search old records and to write of what they have found.

In learning that book the child shall learn also the following things:

No man exists in and for himself alone. He

comes into a world that has been made as it is by the labours and sufferings of countless generations that have preceded him. All the civilization he inherits is the work of former men and women, who have left both good and evil behind them. They sowed and he reaps. In the same way future generations will reap where he sows, and as he has received much from the past he is bound in honour to leave more to the future. He can only do this through and by his community, for in himself he is nothing, and by himself he can achieve nothing. The community is his greater self and his duty is to it as its duty is to him.

Thus his duty is threefold ; to the community, to the future and to himself, and all these are, in fact, one. For he cannot do his duty to the present nor the future unless he do it to himself first. If he choose to remain ignorant, stupid or idle, he injures not merely himself but his community. He is part of that community, his abilities are assets of the community, as of himself. It must be his effort to cultivate himself in all ways, physical and mental, that he be *totus teres atque rotundus*, of even balance and right judgment, so as to fulfil his duty. He must cultivate all his emotions, keeping them under control of his intelligence. He must be happy, and he will be

happy not with a forced or fictitious happiness, but because the only source of happiness is the full use of all his powers towards ends he sees to be good.

All this the child will learn, not by precept, which is worth nothing, but because he is helped to see things for himself, to look at life honourably and bravely, and be afraid or ashamed of nothing that is in life. As Petrarch said "the child should be taught the thoughts of others to enable him to think for himself." He must never be bidden to "believe" anything, except temporarily as a child, but to try all things as soon as he is able to do so. For in reality the central truths of life are very simple, and are obvious even to children when they have not been blinded by untruth. It must be remembered that in certain essentials a child's outlook on life is decided by the time he is seven or eight. The Jesuits say that if they may have a child up to that age they care not who teaches him afterwards, his fate is sealed. And although this is not always true, as some men do manage to break with their bad early teaching, it is so for most men.

This early teaching lies mainly with mothers, and it is for that reason that no greater disaster

can happen to a nation than that its women should lose their sense of humanity and community.

These truths of the community of life and the child's threefold duty are the germs from which alone true conduct can proceed. But for the rest I see no difficulty in making a Code that should be a guide to parents and teachers in training children. It might well be compiled in the new Ministry of Education and could cover a wide area. Let us take three subjects, say the value of money, speaking the truth and making promises, and see what such a Code would have to say about them.

Money is potential power and it stands for all material things. As a lump of coal may, when properly used, be changed into heat and light and movement, and so used to produce many things, so it is with money. It is with money that you feed and house and clothe yourself; it is with money you are educated, amused, helped, hindered, born, married and buried. Though in itself nothing, it is the medium through which all life, individual or communal, is expressed, and it is therefore a necessity of life. No greater untruth could be taught children than to despise money, except to make money an end. The earning of money is the duty of everyone, and all means of

earning money are good, provided the community is not thereby injured. This is rather a matter for the community to decide than for the individual; the community should decide it and the individual should obey. Within those limits the more efficient the individual is in making money the better it is for everybody.

But it must still be remembered that money is a means, not an end. In itself it is nothing, any more than is gold when buried. To learn how to rightly use money when acquired is as necessary as to learn how to acquire it, for if ill-used it is capable of harm. Ways of using money that are injurious to the community should be proscribed by the community, but even within these limits money may be hoarded or wasted or ill-used. So again you must use your intelligence to discern what ways are conducive to your threefold interest, which is, in fact, one interest. There is, of course, no fixed rule, and you have to judge each case for yourself with reference to the surrounding circumstances. Bearing these things in mind, I do not see what difficulty a parent or teacher with examples drawn from daily life would have in teaching a child by degrees a right appreciation of money.

Then take the truth; how can the truth be

ascertained and when should the truth be spoken ? —a piece of knowledge that everyone will admit is most necessary for everyone to learn.

To begin with, when may you say that you know a fact ? Well, as regards events that have happened or circumstances that have existed or exist, the first condition necessary to knowledge is that you have personally seen or heard or otherwise experienced it, and also, because even our senses occasionally deceive us, that either we took such note that deception was not likely or that the experience of others tallied with our own—also, that it was not one of those events so contrary to the ordinary laws of nature that probably some error had crept in. That alone constitutes knowledge. Things that you have read or been told are not things you know.

But although it is always better to know things if we can and never to take another's word for what we can personally verify, yet by the nature of life the things that we can know are few, and there are a number of things for which we are dependent on what we read or are told—how can we test their accuracy or not ? Well, that is a matter of experience in which a number of factors enter, and to say it depends on the trustworthiness or not of the person from whom we got

our information is misleading. There are several factors, and they come in the following order :

I. Did our informant personally know the fact ?
II. Is he a capable or a careless observer ?
III. Had he any personal reason for alleging or exaggerating or altering it ?

If in answer to I. he had no personal experience, then you may always treat the alleged fact as doubtful, because when stories pass from mouth to mouth they become altered, even if the people be naturally sincere.

The answer to II. and III. depends on your observation of the person. You must learn to know who you can trust. When, for instance, a person has a bias in any direction, say Party, or religion, you should always try in other ways to test his accuracy, because men are apt to narrate what pleases them and to suppress what does not. Newspapers, for instance, will print news or such a version of news as suits their politics and suppress all that does not. To get value out of a paper you require its personal equation. As regards history there is this always to be borne in mind, that in the main mankind and the world have been always the same, and that events

which are contrary to natural laws now were always so, and are therefore untrue. The man nowadays who took dreams to be revelations would be rightly regarded as imbecile—he ought rightly to have been so regarded at all times. Use your intelligence as to what is likely to be true, and then always, if possible, before acting on it find out whether it *is* true.

Whenever especially you require knowledge of facts as a base for action, see that your knowledge is knowledge, and as far as possible reject all hearsay.

Thus, the first absolutely necessary condition to knowing the truth is that you be sincere with yourself. Never think a thing is true because you would like it to be true; never be carried away by emotion; never deceive yourself as to your own acts, and especially your own motives. *Always tell yourself the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.* Self-deception by means of self-falsehood is the most dangerous and the most common of vices.

But when it comes to speaking to others it is somewhat different. You can see for yourself that a person who always spoke the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, would be quite intolerable. Speak the truth always

when you can, but remember your sense of community. You must live in pleasant intercourse with many people or the community would break up. Never tell a lie—that is a falsehood told to injure—but conceal the truth or avoid it, or even alter, if by so doing you do less harm than by telling it. It is again a matter for the intelligence. If you are untruthful on the one hand, or rude and ill-mannered on the other, the community will, to save itself, cast you out. Between two evils take the least.

And what are the ethics of promises ?

One of the most important facts to remember about life is that, although in the essentials life is always the same, yet in details it varies continually. There is a constant evolution, not only in our surroundings and circumstances, but in ourselves. We are not the same at thirty as at twenty, nor at fifty as at forty. Our tastes change, because what is necessary to us at one time is not so at another ; our powers, physical and mental, alter, our outlook on life differs. Our circumstances, too, alter, and our environment ; the community of which we form part evolves and our duty towards it alters. At first it was to obey, later it may be to lead. Thus, what it is right and proper for us to do to-day

may to-morrow be injurious to the community and ourselves, and what it is possible to do to-day may be out of our power to-morrow. Therefore, to make any definite promise that we will maintain a certain fixed course of action regardless of change in ourselves, or our surroundings, is an evil thing to do. It may to-day be right and possible, but to-morrow the same course of action might be wrong or impossible. No one can so foresee the future as to tell.

Nevertheless, some promises are necessary. No business of life could be carried on unless contracts were made. We must be able to arrange matters a short time ahead, or life would be impossible. What, then, are the tests of promises we may make and those we should not? The test is not at all difficult. We are justified in promising, within a limited time, to do what we may reasonably suppose we can do, and what, unless some unexpected change occur, it will be well for us to do, and nothing else. A merchant may contract to deliver certain goods at a certain price if he feels reasonably assured that he can procure or manufacture the goods, and that the cost is not likely to have changed before the end of the contract. The means to the fulfilling of the contract must be

within his sight and power. No merchant would agree to continue a contract for fifty years or for life, because he cannot see so far, nor would he contract to do something which depended not on himself alone but on the uncertain action of others.

And to all major promises there should be added a penalty in case of breach, because it must always be recognized that, however careful you are in making promises, the unforeseen may occur, and it may become impossible or disastrous to carry out the promise. If the keeping of the promise injure only yourself even, it may be inadvisable to keep it, but if it injure your community, you have no right to keep it. You have no right to bind yourself to a course of action that will hurt others. Therefore, while promises when made should if possible be kept, otherwise your community will eject you, it should always be borne in mind that if circumstances arise that render the keeping of the promise impossible or injurious to others it is more honourable to break it and to pay the agreed penalty, not for breaking it, but for having made it without due care. Unconditional promises, pledges, vows, for more than a specified and limited time, and which you are not reason-

ably certain you can keep, are dishonourable and abominable things either to give or to demand—especially from children.

Such in brief are some of the Ethics of Common Sense, and they are, in fact, what mankind, when free to do so, generally acts upon.

It will be seen that, while the tests are the welfare of yourself and your community, the quality which enables you to apply the test is intelligence. Without intelligence you cannot see what is right, and therefore you cannot achieve it, so the exercise and the increase of intelligence is the object of all real education.

* * * * *

In some such way as this the children of our new England will be educated, so as to enable them to grow up worthy members of their community, and live full and free and happy lives. Are they so educated now ?

I think if you will remember what you were taught as a child, if you observe what children are taught to-day, you will find that not only are these things not taught, but the very reverse is taught. This is an extract from a book I have found in the hands of many children. The

copy I have is one of the one hundred and ninety-third thousand, and the book is only a sample of many, and is a repetition, in other words, of what they are taught everywhere, in Churches, Chapels, Sunday Schools and by their mothers.

"IT IS FINISHED. What is finished? 'I have finished the work thou gavest me to do.' And what is that work? Simply the work of our salvation. That is the reason why all things are now ready, because Jesus has finished that all-inclusive work. When a thing is finished how much is there left to do? The question sounds too absurd with respect to ordinary things. We hardly take the trouble to answer. Why, nothing, of course! When Jesus had finished the work how much is there left for you to do? Do you not see? NOTHING, of course."

That is the teaching with which they are primed at their entry into life, that there is *Nothing* for them to do in life, and that their brains and their emotions, their capabilities and possibilities were given them for Nothing. Provided, of course, that a priest cleanses them from the sin of being born by dropping water on them, and that thereafter they attend other

ceremonies, there is Nothing else necessary. They will have fully performed all their duties by doing *Nothing*. That is vicariousness at its zenith, and can you wonder that thereafter the child, grown into a man or woman, may be perfectly contented to be defended at others' cost, be rich at others' expense, be wise through others and not himself, and be indifferent to the unhappiness and misery about him? "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world." Why should we bother? We do Nothing, and so are bound for eternal happiness hereafter.

That is what boys and girls are taught while they are small; let us see what boys, when they go to Public Schools, are taught. A distinguished General Officer has, as I write, been making a speech at a well-known Public School, and this is what he told the boys. It is so exactly in accordance with present facts and with generally received ideas as to education and "character," and it has been received with so much approval that it may be taken as representing the ideas of Public School authorities.

"The Public School boy is not to be surpassed; I do not think, myself, that he is to be equalled. He has my greatest admiration. He has had it for years, and I think he will always have it.

The Public Schools give great opportunities to boys to aspire to become leaders either in military or civil life. There they learn habits of obedience, unselfishness, loyalty, co-operation, playing-for-the-side discipline—all that is essential to men who aspire to become leaders."

Intelligence is not mentioned—evidently it is not essential for leaders, either military or civil.

Nor is knowledge of the world and of humanity, its fears, its hopes, its needs, its possibilities. When a boy has acquired obedience and the rest, his "character" is considered formed and his education finished.

Yet if you will consider these qualities, you will find that they are as capable of evil as of good. Obedience to bad leaders and to false ideas; unselfishness that allows yourself to be wantonly set aside or injured; loyalty to untruth and evil traditions; co-operation with those who are playing, not for the good of the country, but for class, or party, or privilege; are not virtues but vices. And the only way to distinguish when they are virtues and when they are vices is by using the intelligence.

Yet intelligence is not even mentioned, and, in fact, it is not taught in Public Schools. The boys are taught *not* to think. As for humanity,

that also is not taught, but the reverse. The Public School boy is generally turned out a snob, a worshipper of rank and authority and atavism, entirely unable to think out any matter for himself.

Do not these gallant lads who at the beginning of life are full of hope and courage, desiring only "to know what is true in order to do what is right" deserve better treatment than this ?

Our political leaders for over a hundred years have been Public School men ; see what they have brought the country to.

Our Generals, too, have not and do not enjoy a great reputation abroad, nor inspire much confidence at home. But why not ?

There is nothing the matter with English children as Nature produces them. They are potentially as able as any people, but something serious occurs later.

They are "educated."

In our new England they will be taught all these qualities, but they will also be told and helped to use their intelligence to make sure that they apply those qualities to right ends and not to wrong ends. They will learn to read the book of human nature so as to see for themselves what it is like, and how so to use their

qualities as to do good, not harm. They will have open minds and their masters will not be ecclesiastics. The boys will be taught that while in this world their duty is to this world, and that, providing they do that duty, they may safely leave the next world to take care of itself.

CHAPTER XIII

A VERNAL WOOD

BELOW the village of Sleepy Hollow is the river, not a great river here, only a mountain stream in fact, hastening from its birth-place in the hills, not very far away, to bring the tribute of its life into the southern sea. Beside the river there is a foot-path passing at first through meadows rich with lush grasses, where red cattle graze. The valley here is broad, enclosed by downs, and on a summer day it seems to be a bowl whereinto the sunshine pours like wine, filling it to the brim.

Beyond the meadows is a wood, mainly of oaks, whose sturdy arms are clothed with lichen, and there are boulders hidden in moss cushions, soft and green. This is a great haunt of birds, of long-tailed tits flitting through the bushes, of yaffingales running up the trees, of yellow dish-washers, water ouzels, thrushes and black-

birds. There are blackcaps, too, sometimes, and in the winter, golden-crested wrens.

Beyond the wood are more meadows, and then the river passes into a long, winding gorge between steep cliffs whereon the heather grows.

In the summer there are many people who come along that path and linger in the wood, or seek coolness in the gorge.

There are villagers going to and fro, fishermen tempting trout, children bathing in the pools, artists sketching, tourists looking at scenery. They sit in sheltered hollows and read books, or sleep, and once I saw a girl crying, with her face hidden in her companion's lap. She had brought her sorrow there, some sorrow that I did not know, that Nature should give her strength again and courage.

To most of those who pass Nature says nothing. The hills, the trees, the stream, the birds' song and the breeze are but mechanical things. The sunlight on the grass, the shadows in the wood, the limpid water, are mere nothings, not so much as a well-lighted stage scene. They admit prettiness and even beauty, but it does not touch them. They see, yet do not see; they hear, but do not hear. With a few others there is more. They feel within them rise a strange

emotion in answer to the glow and life and colour. Their hearts are swollen and their eyes are dim.

But even to them Nature has no voice. Her music has no words, her beauty has no soul, there is within her no message they can understand. She is to them as a sleeping woman radiant with health and beauty, but in whom is no intelligence; as a gorgeously-emblazoned book without a text.

Their emotion, the soul that lies within them, urges them to try and hear the words, to read the text, to wake the sleeping beauty, but their intelligence will have none of it. "No! no!" they answer, "Nature is a dead thing and has no spirit in it. These are beautiful things truly, but of the earth earthly. They are but the product of mechanical forces and they change and die and pass. That is what makes us sad, because it dies like all things." And so they try to imagine to themselves a heaven of stones, a jeweller's heaven, that has no life within it and therefore can never change, that has never lived and therefore cannot die.

In our new England it will not be so. Not a child born there but shall learn to read this book, whose ears shall not be tuned to hear the words

that Nature sings. There shall not be a man or woman who shall not be in true companionship with Nature, whose intelligence shall not be in touch with hers. They will go to her in gladness and in sorrow, and she will whisper secrets to them, the secrets of the world.

Some day, perhaps, I will tell you a great deal of what Nature, human and other, says, and the answers that she gives to those great questions that so trouble us—they are, in fact, very simple answers and obvious—but I cannot so do here. It would take a book to write them. I can only tell you now a line or two.

Under the oak tree near the weir there is a mossy stone ; let us sit on it and observe.

There are some foxgloves growing near and humble bees are paying visits. They see the flowers a long way off and make straight for them. Why ? Because the foxgloves are pink, the colour the humble bee likes best. The honey bee, who is more civilized and dwells in a city, has later tastes and he prefers dark blue or violet, the latest fashionable shade, but the humble bee is rustic, is simpler, and prefers the pink. Let us pick a foxglove head and hold it in our hands and watch. The bee is not shy, he does not mind us at all, he comes and perches on the lip of the

flower, the doorstep, so to speak, put there for him, then he creeps in. As he goes his forehead touches the pistil which is at the top of the cup and leaves there pollen he has brought. Then he goes on and finds his reward, the honey, and sips it up. This finished, he has to come out, so he backs until he is in the hollow where there is more room, gets on his hind legs and turns round. In so doing he touches with his head the anthers which are just above him, and so gets more pollen on his forehead. Then he flies to fertilize with it the next flower. The bell we hold is now fertilized. It was the bee that did it, because it was arranged for the bee and no one else. It was coloured to please the bee, the size is just right for the bee to enter, the pistil and anthers are in exactly the right place, the hollow is there to give him room to turn. Think of the extraordinary ingenuity and the workmanship necessary to such a careful adaptation. And more, note the fine hairs on the throat of the bell. They don't bother the bee because his legs are strong, but they would stop a marauding fly. The foxglove doesn't want the flies to eat her honey, because the flies would not do her work. Only the bee can do that, so it is only the bee she welcomes. She knows all about the bee and what

he wants. She has studied him, or she could not have lived.

So have I watched a bee enter a foxglove a hundred times, so much I can understand, because I can read something of this page—something, not all. Why is the inside white with spots? I am not sure. There is some reason, some good reason, and that reason is written in those spots, but so far I have not been able to read it.

That is the story that the foxglove bell tells you when you look, and there is nothing that has not got its story. Every flower has its story, every twig and every leaf. Why does the oak send out straight branches, while the elm tree branches tend upwards? Because if the elm sent out straight branches they would break. Why does the gorse-pod crack and scatter its seeds like a little shell? Because it wants to launch them into the world, and not keep them tied to their mother's apron-strings. Why do the leaves turn red and gold in autumn? Because the green colouring matter is very difficult for a tree to make, and it has to economize in chlorophyll. It will want all it can get next spring. It wants to shed its leaves, but it cannot afford to lose the chlorophyll, so it withdraws the precious stuff into the end of the twig and then

the leaf can go. And so the questions rise incessantly. Why does the cuckoo choose some nests and not others, how does the gold crest, that tiny atom, cross the seas; why does the puffin change his beak, why? and why? and why? And Nature has her answer always, though as yet we cannot read very much. Still we can read some. And because we can read some answers we know that answers exist for everything. There is not the curve of a leaf, the roughness of a bark, a spot upon a bird's wing, the proboscis of a bee, the white tip upon a fox's tail, that has not got a reason. They are there because they were put there, and they were put there because they achieve some purpose, either because they are necessary to life or because they are beautiful. They were all designed and all worked out not of a sudden, but by experiment and practice through uncounted centuries.

Who designed and put them there?

Religion tells you two things about them: first, that they were made a few thousand years ago just as they are now by an all-knowing and all-mighty Power. We know that is not true. It also says that whoever made them in the first instance, they now are part of "the world, the flesh and the devil." Every animal and bird and

fish and insect and flower is "conceived and born in sin." We know, too, that this is not true.

Science tells or used to tell us that Chance made them. We know that Chance makes nothing, that it always evens itself and therefore that this is not true.

What, then, is true ?

Well, leaving for a time the work of Nature, let us go into a town and see the works of man ; let us watch the streets, the shops, the factories, and consider what we see.

We see innumerable things, motors and carriages and trams and railways, clocks and chronometers and tiny watches, clothes of many kinds, boots and hats, factories with machines that spin and weave and draw out steel or roll it ; houses and shops and roads. Who made these things ? Did Chance design them, or did some One Intelligence design them once for all ? We should laugh at anyone who said this. They were designed each and all of them by intelligences for a given purpose, and the design did not come all at once, but was worked out by degrees through centuries. The intelligences are many. The intelligence that gradually worked out the motor car is not the same as that which worked out the chronometer, neither is the intelligence

which designed the electric tube the same as that which evolved the bicycle. They are all separate, each special trade attending to its own business, each firm to its own speciality. They compete, and try to drive each other out of the market. The sum of what we see is the sum of innumerable intelligences, each working at its own work, regardless of the rest. That is one view, and that is true.

But the complementary view is just as true. These various trades are all separate, actuated by the intelligence of separated men, or groups of men, and yet they are all one. They can exist only by and through each other. None could exist alone. For take one instance only, take a motor car. What goes to the making and use of a car? Metals of many kinds must be obtained by mining, treated in various ways, transported here on ships, ships require captains and crews, ships require docks, and docks require hydraulic engineers. The rubber requires gathering and treating; the cloth must be grown as wool, spun and dyed and weaved. The car must have roads.

And behind and above all there must be a Government or nothing could exist. Their very competition is good and necessary. Therefore it is perfectly true to say that not one of these

machines exists or could exist except by the co-ordinated working of the intelligence of all. It is like all the others, the product of One Intelligence composed of innumerable parts, but still One.

And now why should you reason any differently about Nature's work than about man's? Why in the one case should you use your observation and intelligence to discover the causes of things and refuse to do so in the other? Do you suppose that the Universe is divided into two parts, in one of which intelligence is the only guide, while in the other you may not use it?

At all events I do not think so.

I judge Nature's work as I do man's. I see in Nature innumerable things and I know they are made by design. I know, too, that only intelligence can design, so I am sure they were designed by intelligence. True, I cannot see the workman, but neither did I see my watch being made. I see the work, and that is enough.

Therefore, I see in Nature's work exactly what I see in man's work, namely, innumerable specialized intelligences, making certain work by methods or on designs slowly worked out and improved for millions of years. And because I see that all Nature's work is—like man's work—dependent

on all the rest and on some natural order, I infer a co-ordinating Power above, that is to say, a Government. Essentially they are all one.

That is as far as I mean to go at present, not very far, you say, but even so consider what it means.

To the child brought up to see this truth, what a changed world is there. No longer to him is Nature dead and loveless, no longer unintelligible, it has become a fairyland. That sense of awe and wonder which is in us all needs no starvation diet of imaginary miracles, but is fed to the full. Not a plant, a leaf, a bird, but speaks of some Intelligence unseen yet known, not in some imaginary heaven, but here on earth, decking it with flowers, making it beautiful and useful. Behind every kind of plant, of bird, of fish, behind all living things, behind me and behind you there is the Intelligence that designed the frame, their bodies and our body. Not a perfect intelligence, for no forms are perfect, but immense compared to ours. Could we design or make an eye, a brain, a flower? What is the most delicate of man's work compared to a mosquito's proboscis, or his gayest colours to a kingfisher? Who that has learnt how Nature's processes turn the air, the earth, into grapes, and how the fer-

ment turns the grape-juice into wine, will care for the miracle of Cana, who that watches the wheat grow and flower and knows how it is made into bread, who knows how the fish in the stream increase, will think twice about the miracle of the loaves and fishes.

And above all, the child will learn, learn not as texts or precepts, but as living truths, to be verified every day, that the one thing valuable in this or any other world is intelligence. Only by intelligence did these things come to be, only by intelligence can they continue to exist, only by intelligence can any improvement be made. And the first quality of intelligence is its capacity to look facts always squarely in the face, and so recognize its past errors. Loki, the locked mind, is the real devil. If the Intelligence that made the world has not been ashamed to see and correct His own mistakes, and evolution is full of them, should we be ashamed to do so ?

That will be a very different world from what children are brought up in to-day, a wider world, a truer world, a world that has an infinite perspective. And so these children grown into men and women will make at last for themselves a new religion, founded not on the nightmares of fanatics nor the inventions of priests, but on what

they read out of the Book of Life. Their God will be a real God, known, as only we can know anyone, by His acts, and no one will need any interpreter for Him.

> "One impulse from a vernal wood
> May teach you more of man,
> Of moral evil and of good
> Than all the sages can."

Nothing could be more true than that.

CHAPTER XIV

WHEN WAR WILL END

THE value and the pleasure of life, nay, even life itself, lies in the overcoming of difficulties, in the use of all our faculties and all our emotions to accomplish ends which our intelligence recognizes and sets before us. Were there no more difficulties to overcome, were we not continually pressed by Necessity to advance, life would soon cease with us. Our intelligence, remaining unused, would atrophy, our faculties and emotions fade into nothingness. Life is a struggle, and if the struggle cease then would life cease too. That is a first definition of life. Therefore it can never be supposed, never even be hoped, that no matter how true the structure of our national life may be, we shall ever reach a stage when we can sit down and fold our hands and do nothing but "amuse ourselves" because all difficulties will have been overcome.

So, although if our national life be reconstructed on true and natural foundations, we shall have gone a long way towards solving some of our most pressing immediate difficulties, new difficulties will present themselves to be surmounted in their turn.

That a reconstruction somewhat as sketched out here will solve many questions is, I think, certain. The relations of the sexes would be greatly improved, crime and civil injustice would be diminished, the land would be fully used, poverty would disappear and a science of Government would displace the present chaos. Even the population question would be partly if not entirely solved. The immigration of foreigners, whether wealthy or poverty-stricken, would cease. A new England would not tolerate strangers who came in to reap what she with so much labour and suffering had sowed, or to take advantage of us. Our Councils would accept none such, and the well-being of our working classes would not be lowered by the influx of alien paupers. Let each country wash its own dirty linen and send us none of it, driving our own people to emigrate while England is filled with non-English. It is a very pleasant thing to say that we are a refuge to which the oppressed of other lands can come, it is a sad business for ourselves. The new England will be

for the English and no one else. If other nationalities envy our well-being let them achieve the same at home and not come here to injure ours.

Then, with the village communities in full health, the birth-rate will adjust itself to the circumstances. When a man sees that his community is as populous as it can be with health, he will not procreate children who will have to go elsewhere. He will have acquired a sense of responsibility in this matter which he now has not got. And that sense will be fortified by the sense of the community which will condemn families of unnecessary size. There is now no such public opinion, because no communities exist. Further, the community will resent that a man should have a family bigger than he can educate and start in life, because if the man cannot do this, the community for its own sake would have to do it, and it would be an expense. Now, when men live in communities, they are very sensitive to the sense of that community, because they share it, and they know that the community is right. But in the present anarchy there is nothing to stop a man having a dozen children and letting them all grow up ignorant and ill-fed.

It is only by these means that population can

be adjusted to means of subsistence, and in this way it can be done. In many other matters, too, the village community furnishes a complete and early solution.

But there are others in which it does not do so, and one of these is war. Let us consider for a moment the causes of wars, of the present war, for instance. What was its cause, and whose was the fault ?

It will be said at once that if we cannot discover this, and fix the responsibility for this war, it will not be for want of material. There is material and to spare. The world has been flooded with official books, blue, green, white, all the colours of the rainbow, with speeches by Foreign Secretaries, Chancellors and Ministers, with leading articles, with private books. Nothing was ever so thrashed out as the causes of this war.

To which the simple answer is that all this flood of ink and oratory has never even touched the causes of the war. It has discussed and wrangled over the occasions of the war, but of the causes not one word. They have one and all completely ignored the real causes.

Let us take some of the causes alleged by one side or the other and see what value they have.

1. It was Germany's fault. She, or rather the Prussians, thirsted for European dominance. That was the real cause.

Maybe she did so thirst, but why did she thirst? Such a thirst is unnatural and is a symptom of disease. How came she to acquire it?

2. Germany had built up a great military organization and was obliged to use it. It cost more than she could bear and she could only indemnify herself by war.

True, but why did she build it up?

3. The real cause of the war lay rather with the surrounding nations than with Germany. She was strong, virile and efficient, both for peace and war; none of them was anything like so efficient. Now, when an efficient nation is surrounded by inefficient nations, the natural law of the struggle for life comes in and the efficient attacks the inefficient. Had the other nations been as virile as Germany the latter would never have dreamt of a war.

This is quite true. But why were the other nations inefficient? They knew the war was bound to come unless the disparity were done away with. Why did it remain?

And so you might deal with all the other

explanations. They are not explanations at all, they are only words.

The cause of war, the only cause of every war that has ever occurred, has been ill-health in the nation that made the war inevitable, together usually with an equal ill-health on the part of all, or of most, of the other nations engaged. The ill-health has shown itself by different symptoms in the different nations, but the cause is the same.

Thus the reason why Germany was so armed beyond her strength was not fear of outside but of inside trouble. It was the only way to maintain a military caste in domination over the people. To keep the nation in subjection it must be subject to military discipline; to avert a revolution and internal war there must be external war.

No one, I think, who has really cared to study Germany during the last hundred, and especially the last thirty, years doubts this. How often have Germans told me: "After the next war there will be no Socialists." There was the real enemy of the German Government, not France, not Russia, not England, but its own people.

Again, England knew war was inevitable, why would it not listen to Lord Roberts and

have universal service? Why did it risk its very life and refuse? Because the Government is not and has never been representative of the people, and the Trade Unions, who have great stopping power, though no initiative power, preferred to risk what they hoped after all might not come to the certainty of a military domination if they acceded. They had a choice of two evils and took the most remote.

Aggressive acts, whether of a man or a nation, are symptoms of disease. No man and no nation that is healthy and happy at home seeks to dominate others. He knows he has all he can do to manage his home affairs, and he means to do that first. It is unhappiness at home that looks abroad for relief, slavery at home that longs for more abroad.

And on the other hand, it is ill-health that prevents a man or nation preparing for all dangers that seem likely to come, that shuts its ears to warnings and shudders at a sword. Strong and true and healthy nations will not be afraid to arm to defend themselves, because their Government will be themselves, and the arm forged to meet an aggressive foreign foe can never be used to wound others' liberty abroad, or our own liberty at home. Every man

will be a patriot because he will have his share in the land that is his.

Such being the cause of all wars, how will the Federation of Europe or of some States in Europe do away with this cause? We hear this idea much praised nowadays—what sense is there in it? The idea is not new. We had at one time a Federation of Europe that was called Christendom, and the Vicar of God was the head of it. How did it act? It acted exactly as any federation must do if effective at all, it crushed out liberty everywhere. It simply added a further and more strangling bond to those already existing, and it brought all the weight of the Federation to bear on any peoples who wanted to be free—the Dutch, for instance. It interfered in all domestic matters as, of course, it must do if it is to rule at all, and it made tyrannies doubly secure. It was against this Federation that we revolted in the time of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, and Spain was the mandatory of the Federation to reduce us to order. Our Government was outlawed, and war internal and external was plotted against us. That is the sort of thing we are advised to return to. We are to submit to a foreign domination, if not of the Pope, yet of other foreigners. We

are to submit to them not merely Federation affairs, but home affairs. For the declaration that a Federal Council could not interfere in domestic affairs, is absurd. It could not exist unless it did so. For suppose the English Minister at the Federation Council refused to agree to any particular measure which, however, the majority of the Federation had determined on, either the Federation must dissolve, or it must use force to England, or it must plot a domestic revolution in England which would provide a Government agreeing with the Federation. You cannot divide up life and Government into watertight compartments. Essentially they are one.

Federations do not prevent wars. As long as the parties to the Federation are agreed no harm occurs, but then no harm would occur even if no Federation machine existed. Their interests being one they would have acted together. And directly strong differences do occur no Federation will stop war. The Federation of the United States did not stop civil war in 1860–66, nor will it stop any future war between opposing interests. Nor, again, will it prevent a social revolution in America when the time is ripe. On the contrary, it renders wars more

inevitable, because, being Federated, the choice is between subjection and war, and free peoples prefer war.

In what way has the Federation of Germany under the Hohenzollerns stopped war? It increased the danger of war, and rendered it more disastrous when it came.

But Federations do increase domestic servitude, because they add a super-master to all the rest.

This is equally true of a Federation of the British Empire as of a Federation of Europe. No more disastrous folly could be imagined.

Federations have always been favoured by Ruling Classes for very obvious reasons, but how free peoples can fall into such a booby trap I cannot imagine. United action to protect common interests, Yes; but a machine-made Federation, No.

War will cease when the causes of war are removed, and only then. For war internal and external is to nations what the high temperature and delirium of fever is to the patient; it is Nature's way, the only way of killing the microbe in the blood that is threatening the patient's life.

There used to be a time, not very long ago, when doctors thought that the high temperature

was the enemy—they knew nothing about the microbe—and that if they could keep down the temperature, the patient would do well. In antipyrine and its kindred drugs they discovered such a means—the temperature was reduced—and the microbe killed the patient. I have myself seen many such cases. Now the doctors know better, and they try to keep the microbe out in the beginning. Exactly this same thing is true of war and nations.

The only true way to prevent war is that all nations should keep themselves healthy and their national life free from the deadly microbes of false ideas and false institutions. And the only true way to promote friendship and mutual respect between nations is, not by adding artificial bonds, but by helping all to be free and healthy.

For what Montaigne says—as I have already quoted—of man and woman is equally true of man and man, community and community, nation and nation, that "the knot of the will and the affection is so much the more slackened and made loose by how much that of constraint is drawn closer."

War will cease when all the peoples of the world are free and healthy. And, until then,

all that any one nation can do is to make itself healthy, and in the plenitude of that health and freedom to be so strong and so wise that while no enemy shall find it unprepared no friend shall fear it will misuse its strength. Only by organization in some such way as I have described here can that be done, because that is Nature's way, and therefore the only true way. And in the fullness of time, some day, it is sure to come.

THE END

PRINTED AT
THE CHAPEL RIVER PRESS,
KINGSTON, SURREY.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

Form L9–75m-7,'61(C1437s4)444

HN
389 Fielding-Hall -
F46w Way of peace

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 788 300 2

HN
389
F46w